

# The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1899.

*The Editor of the CLASSICAL REVIEW will be glad to receive short paragraphs (or materials for such paragraphs) upon classical topics of current interest. These should reach him as early as possible in the month preceding the publication of the REVIEW.*

WE are glad to learn the success of the first efforts to found a British School at Rome. The provisional committee, a long roll of well known scholars, artists, and archaeologists, since reinforced by the powerful accession of the English Ambassador at Rome, met on the 25th of October, when it framed a temporary constitution and elected an executive committee, with power to add to its number. This at present consists of Professor Pelham, President of Trinity College, Oxford, Professors Reid and P. Gardner, and Messrs. G. A. Macmillan, Haverfield and Loring. The new institution, which should prove a powerful stimulus to the pursuit of Roman archaeology by our countrymen, will have the benefit of close union and co-operation with the existing School at Athens. The readers of this journal will wish it every success.

The first 'query' appears in the present number. We are encouraged by the replies which have been received to the inquiries in our last issue to think that these queries will prove a useful feature in the *Classical Review*. This usefulness will be increased if contributors, whether of queries or solutions, will make their contri-

butions as succinct as possible. It may be added that all requests for information upon classical topics will be admissible except such as ask for advice or opinion upon the works of living scholars.

We are glad to see that University College, Liverpool, has recognised the duty of University teaching to contribute to the advancement of learning. *Otia Merseiana*, the first number of which has just appeared, forms a volume externally attractive and internally of varied interest. Perhaps the other University colleges will not long lag behind.

Apropos of Academical publications, we are glad to see the University of Sydney in the field with a catalogue of its collection of Greek and Italian pottery. This welcome sign of the interest in classical studies at the antipodes is the work of Miss Louisa Macdonald.

It has been thought advisable to revive in the 'Brief Notices' of the present number an intermitted custom of the *Classical Review*. The editor will be particularly grateful to scholars who are able to offer their help in this department.

## NOTES ON THE ODYSSEY.

## § 207.

ῥέα δ' ἀρίγνωτος γόνος ἀνέρος, ᾧ τε Κρονίων  
ὄλβον ἐπικλώσῃ γαμέοντί τε γεινομένῳ τε.

For γεινομένῳ editors generally accept Bekker's γιγνομένῳ, present company not excluded. But in this place it is not a question of the γόνος being born, but of his father's good luck in marrying and *begetting*. Read then γειναμένῳ, 'in marriage and as a father,' for I dare not suggest that γεινομένῳ should be kept as a present, 'in begetting.'

## § 353.

οἱ δ' αἰεὶ βούλοντο θεοὶ μεμνησθαι ἐφετμένῳ.

The presence of αἰεὶ alone, apart from the context, shows that βούλοντο must be equal in force to a gnomic aorist. But first βούλοντο cannot be anything but an imperfect, and secondly the gnomic aorist should be augmented. Read then οἱ δ' αἰεὶ ἐβόλοντο. For ἐβόλοντο is an aorist form, or at least Homer thought so, seeing that at a 234, νῦν δ' ἐτέρως ἐβόλοντο θεοί, the imperfect gives no sort of sense on any fair interpretation (var. ἐβάλοντο, ἐβούλοντο, βούλοντο). Was the present βόλομαι a later (though Homeric) formation incorrectly derived from this aorist? And should we at π 387 read ἀλλ' ἐβόλεσθε for ἀλλὰ βόλεσθε (βούλεσθε MSS. mostly)?

## § 477.

πρίν γ' ὅτ' ἀν' Αἰγύπτῳ διυπετέος ποταμοῖο  
αὐτὺς ὕδωρ ἔλθῃς ῥέξῃς θ' ἱερὰς ἐκατόμβας.

Homer only uses the Attic accusative with reserve, with such words as δώματα and the like mostly. To say ἐλθεῖν ὕδωρ then is surely a great strain upon his language. Suppose then we read, without changing a letter, πρίν γ' ὅτ' ἀν' Αἰγύπτῳ κ.τ.λ. That Menelaus sails *up* the river, at least a little way, seems shown by 581, where he says:

ἄψ δ' εἰς Αἰγύπτῳ διυπετέος ποταμοῖο  
στήσα νέας.

But I confess that I should prefer πρίν γ' ὅτ' εἰς at 477 also; the interloping ὅταν seems to have done much mischief in many places.

## ζ 328.

ὡς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος· τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.  
αὐτῷ δ' οὐ πω φαίνεται ἐναντίῃ.

αὐτῷ? To whom then *did* she appear?

If αὐτῷ stands first alike in verse and sentence, it evidently must have the full force of 'to him *himself*,' and could only gain a meaning by being opposed to somebody else, some representative of Odysseus to whom Athena did actually appear. To make things worse she does appear to *Odysseus himself* twenty lines further on.<sup>1</sup> But how! Not in her own form but in disguise; she never shows herself in her own form to him till he gets back to Ithaca (if she ever exactly does so even then). Read therefore αὐτή.

## θ 208.

ξείνος γάρ μοι ὅδ' ἐστί· τίς ἂν φιλέοντι μάχοιτο;

Epic idiom appears to require ὃ γ' for ὅδ'.

## λ 271. μητέρα τ' Οἰδιπόδαο ἶδον.

It is not Homeric to use τε as a connecting particle between different paragraphs, and it cannot here mean *both*. Qu. δ'! At 321 and 326 τε may mean *both*, but δε would certainly be more natural here also.

## ν 203.

πῇ δὴ χρήματα πολλὰ φέρω τάδε; πῇ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς  
πλάζομαι; αἰθ' ὄφελον μῆναι κ.τ.λ.

If we had φέρω here without πλάζομαι we should never doubt that it was subjunctive. Read then πλάζωμ'; αἰθ' ὄφελον, which would be certainly corrupted to πλάζομαι. An exactly similar corruption is found in several other lines of Homer, e.g. A 67.

## ο 54.

τοῦ γάρ τε ξείνος μμνήσκειται ἥματα πάντα  
ἀνδρὸς ξεινοδόκου, ὃς κεν φιλότῃ παρὰ σῃ.

A pretty sentiment, a very pretty sentiment, and who is the owner of this very pretty sentiment? Not Homer surely, or at least if he is, the lines are displaced. Telemachus with characteristic impatience and unpracticalness has (literally) kicked up Pisistratus in the middle of the night

<sup>1</sup> Hence Knight bracketed 328-331, but his objection to them falls to the ground if we change αὐτῷ.

and wants to be off at once. Pisistratus answers sleepily that they cannot drive through the night and besides they had better wait till Menelaus give them gifts and send them off properly. 'For,' he continues, 'a guest remembers a good host all his life.' But clearly the observation does not need to be addressed to Telemachus but to Menelaus if anybody. 'Give presents that the recipient may remember you' is sense, but 'Take presents that you may remember the giver' is surely a recommendation never yet given to mortal man. So the lines are probably an interpolation like some other maxims in Homer.

ψ 215. αἰεὶ γάρ μοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν  
ἐρρίγει, μὴ τίς με βροτῶν ἀπάφοιτο  
Γέπεσσι  
ἐλθὼν· πολλοὶ γὰρ κακὰ κέρδεα βουλευ-  
ουσιν.

218. οὐδέ κεν Ἀργεῖη Ἑλένη Διὸς ἐκγεγανῖα  
ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἄλλοδαπῷ ἐμίγη φιλότῃ καὶ  
ἐνῇ,  
εἰ φείδει ὃ μιν αὐτίς ἀρήιοι νῆες Ἀχαιῶν  
ἀξέμεναι Φοῖκόνδε φίλῃν ἐς πατρίδ'  
ἐμμελλον.

τὴν δ' ἦτοι βέξαι θεὸς ὤρορε Φέργον  
ἀφεικές·

τὴν δ' ἀάτην οὐ πρόσθεν ἐφ' ἐγκάθετο  
θυμῷ

224. λυγρὴν, ἐξ ἧς πρῶτα καὶ ἡμέας ἵκετο  
πένθος.  
νῦν δ', ἐπεὶ ἦδη σήματ' ἀριφραδέα κατέ-  
λεξας κ.τ.λ.

Lines 218—224 are rejected with great unanimity by editors and critics, beginning with the Alexandrines, on the ground of their being 'inapposite and spoiling the connection of thought . . . Helen's case is no real illustration of Penelope's . . . Nor is it at all to the point *here* to throw the responsibility of Helen's blind act of folly on Aphrodite.' (Merry). But I am not aware that any one has even proposed any explanation of what the interpolator was aiming at, if any deliberate interpolator there were. Evidently you do not help things by assuming an interpolation unless you can show some reason for it; the mystery remains precisely the same. When Odysseus tells us that a man might earn double wages among the Laestrygonies if he were *ἄπνοος* because there is no night there, it was possible for a stupid creature to add the inept explanation τὸν μὲν βουκολῶν τὸν δ' ἀργυφὰ μῆλα νομεύων. When the Platonic Socrates informs us that he feared to study the idea in itself lest his mental vision

should be blinded, and so he took refuge in λόγοι, it was possible for some 'muddled and blundering soul' to add the explanation that he might be blinded βλέπων πρὸς τὰ πράγματα τοῖς ὄμμασι καὶ ἐκάστη τῶν αἰσθήσεων ἐπιχειρῶν ἀπτεσθαι αὐτῶν. But what conceivable reason was there for anyone to add ψ 218—224 to this speech of Penelope? If we can find that reason, then we also find that the original poet himself might have a meaning.

Another possibility, however, is that these lines have got into a wrong place, like ν 276—278. They do not look like it.

Then in themselves they are absolute *Odyssey*. If any line more than another has the very trick of the poet's voice, that melancholy radiance which is his most distinctive mark, it is surely λυγρὴν ἐξ ἧς πρῶτα καὶ ἡμέας ἵκετο πένθος. A line like that is no interpolator's; I would as soon reject *tendentesque manus ripae ulterioris amore* as un-Virgilian.

If then Homer himself inserted this passage of set purpose, is there no explanation to be found? I think there is. Helen, in spite of the tender way in which she is treated in the *Odyssey*, is the wife who by her faithlessness has brought woe upon all Greece, and on Odysseus and Penelope among the rest. Penelope is just the opposite type, the wife who by her faithfulness redeems the character of her sex and saves the wreck of the fortune of Odysseus, well nigh destroyed by the action of Helen. Well enough may the poet put this reference to Helen in her mouth, in almost the last words he gives her, to point his moral.

And the danger against which Penelope was on her guard was the mistake into which Helen fell. The reason Penelope gives for her long obstinacy in refusing to recognize Odysseus is that she was afraid a stranger would deceive her and cause her to love him under the false pretence of his being Odysseus. Helen *was* deceived by a stranger and *did* love him, though not under the same pretence nor with the same excuse. But if Helen had been wiser and more prudent, if she had possessed the very qualities for which Penelope is renowned, she would have foreseen the consequences and would have refrained. Such I take to be the meaning of this obscure reference, and it is made more obscure by the Homeric way of parataxis. τὴν δ' ἦτοι βέξαι κ.τ.λ. is not an independent thought, but means 'though to be sure it was not altogether her own fault, but Aphrodite's.' It was worthy indeed of Homer to put this excuse for another

as the finishing touch to one of his sweetest characters, and it was worthy of his commentators—but I live in a glass house. O divine Homer, 'cui tantum de te licuit?'

In fact, to spoil all this lovely speech for a moment by a clumsy paraphrase, it comes to this: 'Do not be angry if I refused to take you, a stranger, for my husband at once. Many devise evil devices as Paris did or as Helen did. It was because *she* was in such a hurry to take a stranger for her husband without reflecting on the consequences that she brought this woe to pass.' So does one drop of the bitterness of twenty years overflow, to be effaced at once by the forgiving spirit which can find excuse for her worst enemy. So does Homer at the very end of his poem go out of his way to exalt Penelope above Helen, the heroine of the *Odyssey* above the heroine of Troy.

And that this is his object in thus dragging in the reference to Helen and so sorely puzzling his critics becomes all the more manifest if we consider another passage. When Odysseus sees Agamemnon among the dead, the latter relates his doom at the hands of the wicked woman, ἔξοχα λυγρὰ φιδυῖα, who is the most complete contrast to Penelope. 'Clytemnestra,' he says, 'has brought shame upon all women who shall be hereafter, even upon such as be virtuous.' 'Truly,' replies Odysseus, 'Zeus has hated

the race of Atreus exceedingly by the counsels of women from the beginning; many of us perished *for the sake of Helen*, and unto thee did Clytemnestra devise doom.' 'Therefore,' says Agamemnon, 'be not thou over-kind to thy wife, nor tell her all things,<sup>1</sup> but *thou* wilt not be slain by thy wife; too wise is she, and too prudent of heart, Penelope daughter of Icarius.' And he goes on to draw a strong contrast between Penelope and Clytemnestra. But Odysseus has implied the same contrast with *Helen* as Penelope does in ψ, though both in λ and ψ it is only hinted at in a very delicate manner; the poet does not care to say anything strong against the canonized Helen, whom too he has himself excused as much as he could in δ.

Upon the whole then I would say that, even granting my explanation to be fanciful and strained (though I believe in it firmly myself), at any rate it is better not to resort to the futile expedient of bracketing this passage because the object of putting it in is not clear.

ARTHUR PLATT.

<sup>1</sup> The following translation of these words (μῦθον ἅπαντα πηφανεύμεν), once given me amid the sympathetic laughter of a profane male class, deserves record: 'Do not tell your wife every story that you know.'

#### THE 'TRAGIC POET' ALCAEUS.

A glance at the index of tragic poets in Haigh's *Tragic Drama of the Greeks* reveals the names of several of the lyric poets who for some reason have been enrolled with the tragedians by ancient writers. It would be interesting to know how to account for this fact in each instance. The presence of Arion in the list requires no explanation. The statement of Suidas about the δράματα τραγικά of Pindar is no longer taken seriously. As regards Xenophanes, Wilamowitz (*Homerische Untersuchungen* p. 243, n. 13) might have adopted the language of Bentley concerning the comic poet Agathon in Suidas, announcing: 'I will make bold to expunge this Tragic Xenophanes out of the Catalogue of Mankind. For he sprung but up like a mushroom out of a rotten passage in Eusebius.' The passage in Eusebius under Olymp. 61<sup>3</sup> = 534/3 (ii. p. 48, Schöne) is amended to

read: Ξενοφάνης φυσικός <καὶ Θέσπις> τραγωδοποιός. This should be added to Haigh's notice. A satisfactory explanation of Suidas' statements about Simonides and Alcaeus has not, so far as I know, been offered. And yet, as I think, it is not far to seek so far as concerns Alcaeus.

Suidas says: 'Ἀλκαῖος Ἀθηναῖος τραγικός, ὃν τινες θέλουσι πρῶτον τραγικὸν γεγονέναι. No other ancient writer knows of a tragic poet Alcaeus. In default of something better one might be tempted with Dieterich (Pauly-Wissowa, *Encyc. s.v.*) to adopt the suggestion of Meineke (*Hist. Crit.* p. 247) that a tragic Alcaeus was invented on account of the corruption or misunderstanding of the title of a play of the comic poet of this name, who flourished about the beginning of the fourth century. In support of this view the words *Alcaeus in Coelo tragoedia* in Macrobius *Saturn.* 5, 20 are

quot  
the  
part  
expl  
back  
Ther  
The  
have  
notic  
No  
170,  
to su  
repres  
prere  
good  
poetr  
appea  
were  
ing.  
beaut  
also  
catchi  
the tr  
the re

ταῦτ' ἔ  
ὁ δὲ  
ὁ δ' αὖ

It w  
should  
tragic  
to lea  
time o  
the tr  
the cu  
'Ἀλκαῖ  
Dindor  
of mod  
of the  
conject  
the v  
though  
chronol  
Herma  
some.  
Kēios  
stroke  
and Al  
the cas  
posed o

The i  
referre  
material  
of its c  
be pard  
calling  
may be  
names



quoted, a corruption, as Fabricius saw, of the title *Κωμωδοτραγῳδία*. But the last part of the notice of Suidas is against this explanation. The tragic Alcaeus is pushed back to the very beginning of tragedy. There must be some explanation of this. The origin of the error is more likely to have been a misunderstanding of some notice about the lyric poet.

Now the passage in Aristoph. *Thesm.*, 159-170, is precisely of the kind to have given rise to such a misunderstanding. Agathon is represented as explaining his theory of the prerequisite to good poetry—good looks and good clothes. 'It is contrary to the spirit of poetry for a poet to be wild and shaggy in appearance. Ibycus, Anacreon, and Alcaeus were dandified in their dress and bearing. Phrynichus, too, was beautiful, and beautifully dressed; therefore his dramas also were beautiful,' etc. The κηδεστής, catching at the familiar name of Phrynichus, the tragic poet, then proceeds to illustrate the reverse of Agathon's proposition:—

ταῦτ' ἄρ' ὁ Φιλοκλῆς αἰσχρὸς ὢν αἰσχροῦς ποιεῖ,  
ὁ δὲ Ξενοκλῆς ὢν κακὸς κακῶς ποιεῖ,  
ὁ δ' αὖ Θεόγνης ψυχρὸς ὢν ψυχρῶς ποιεῖ.

It was inevitable that some grammarian should see in this passage an allusion to a tragic poet Alcaeus. We are not surprised to learn from the scholia that before the time of Aristophanes of Byzantium Ἀχαιοῦς, the tragic poet, had displaced Ἀλκαῖος in the current texts. Aristophanes restored Ἀλκαῖος, doubtless for good reasons, and Dindorf has ably defended it. The attempts of modern scholars, seizing upon the pretext of the early variant, to substitute their own conjectures for both the original word and the variant, have not been successful, though Fritzsche's *κῶ* Κείος (to secure a chronological sequence in the names!) and Hermann's *ἀρχαῖος* have found favour with some. If there had been an old variant *χῶ* Κάος we should have explained at one stroke the tradition about both Simonides and Alcaeus. As it is, it seems to me that the case of the latter is at last fairly disposed of.

The index of poets to which I have already referred is a most convenient collection of material, valuable for reference on account of its completeness. For this reason I may be pardoned for taking the opportunity of calling attention to a few omissions, which may be remedied in a second edition. Four names should be added, Astydamos III,

Aristocrates, Ariphron, and Polychares. The Astydamos who represented the Athenian guild of τεχνῖται before the Amphictyonic Council in *C.I.A.* ii. 551 is designated as a ποιητὴς τραγῳδίας. The inscription cannot be dated before 279 B.C. But this person cannot be identical with the second Astydamos, who won his first victory in 372. Aristocrates, ποιητὴς κακῆς τραγῳδίας, won at the Charitesia at Orchomenos about 75 B.C., *C.I.G.* Meg. Orop. Boeot. 1761. Two pairs of choregi set up a stone, *C.I.A.* ii. 1280, to commemorate three victories, the poets being Dicaeogenes, Ariphron, and Polychares. Köhler rightly dated the inscription about the beginning of the fourth century on account of the synchoregia, and recognized Dicaeogenes as the tragic poet of this period (*Hermes* 2, p. 26). Now we have choregic inscriptions pertaining to all of the lyric and dramatic festivals, but the practice of nominating two men to bear the charges of the choregia seems to have obtained only for the dramatic contests at the City Dionysia, and only for a decade or two. Therefore, although Ariphron and Polychares are nowhere mentioned as tragic poets, there is no other course open but to accept them as belonging to the same category as Dicaeogenes. Brunck (*Insc. Choreg.* p. 106) has consistently done this, identifying Ariphron with the poet hitherto known only as a dithyrambic poet of this period, Ariphron of Sicyon. The name Aradas must give way to Pharadas in the inscription which gives the victors at the Musaea at Thespieae, now published in *C.I.G.* Meg. Orop. Boeot. 1760. The date established by Dittenberger is the first century B.C., not the third, which Haigh gives following the earlier publications. The date of the appearance of Ameinias at Orchomenos should be given as the first century instead of the second, according to the last publication, *C.I.G.* Meg. Orop. Boeot. 3197. In another instance the corrected dating is not given. The important inscription *C.I.A.* ii. 1289, recording the victory of Phanostatus, is no longer to be dated 332 with Kumanudis and Foucart, but 307, as Köhler demonstrated in *Ath. Mitth.* 3, 236 sqq. Judging by the occasion of the lyric events and especially by the fact that the comic victors are given last, we may safely conclude that the occasion was the Lenaea. The statement that 'Theophilus won the prize for tragedy at the Dionysia for 387' is misleading, if not positively wrong. *C.I.A.* ii. 971 c, to which reference is made, is a mass of confused notes, jotted down by Pittakis, of

readings taken from no one knows how many fragmentary inscriptions, belonging to different classes. So far no one has succeeded in solving the puzzle. There is nothing whatever to indicate that the items belong together which Köhler selects as constituting the list of victors for 387. Köhler himself advances this merely as one combination out of other possible combinations. It would have been better if he had kept such guesswork out of the *Corpus*, for it is now current in all of our handbooks as if it were the authorized version of an inscription. The Theophilus is in all probability not a tragic poet at all, but the well-known comic poet. One is surprised to find the name of Datis in the list unbracketed. On the other hand, is Mesatus to be rejected summarily? Bentley declared that no such poet is ever mentioned except in the spurious Euripidean

epistle to Cephisophon, but he did not know of the scholium to Arist. *Vesp.* 1502. It was certainly a clever suggestion of Meineke that the name rested on a misinterpretation of ὁ μέστος in the text. But the writer of the scholium at least did not misinterpret these words. And yet he could not have indicated more clearly that there was a tragic poet of this name than he does in the words οὐ τὸ ν τραγικὸν λέγει Μέστων. A real blemish is found under Nicomachus. A poet of this name once defeated Euripides and Theognis. He was the author of an *Oidípous*. There was another Nicomachus of Alexandria, also author of an *Oidípous*. Haigh proposes to identify them, explaining that the poet who defeated Euripides 'was born at Alexandria, but subsequently migrated to Athens.'

EDWARD CAPPS.

#### NOTES ON SOPHOCLES'S *ANTIGONE*.

No satisfactory emendation of ἄτης ἄτερ in v. 4 has been suggested. It seems hardly likely that any such is forthcoming. Are not those scholars on the right scent after all that maintain the integrity of ἄτης ἄτερ and seek the corruption in the negatives? I cannot think that the simple change of οὐτ' to οὐκ before ἄτης ἄτερ satisfies all the conditions of the case; nor would the change of that οὐτ' to οὐδ' do so without some further change in the sentence. However, I venture to think that οὐδὲν γὰρ οὐτ' ἀλγεινὸν οὐδ' ἄτης ἄτερ is right, so far as it goes; only we need to make the rest of the sentence conform to it. It is to be observed that in οὐτ' αἰσχρὸν οὐτ' ἄτιμον in v. 5 we have a positive and a negative term of nearly the same meaning conjoined. Now if in v. 4 we are right in maintaining, as above, the soundness of ἄτης ἄτερ, we have in οὐτ' ἀλγεινὸν οὐδ' ἄτης ἄτερ what is practically the same as a positive and a negative term of similar meaning correlated as parts of the same (negative) phrase. If v. 5 is to offer anything that shall at all exactly balance this, we naturally expect after οὐτ' αἰσχρὸν something like (as far as the sense goes) οὐδ' ὀνειδίζουσ' ἄτερ or οὐδὲ τιμῆς μέτα. This brings us to what I venture to suggest as possibly the original text here:

οὐδὲν γὰρ οὐτ' ἀλγεινὸν οὐδ' ἄτης ἄτερ  
οὐτ' αἰσχρὸν οὐδ' ἔντιμον ἔσθ', κτέ.

I may add here that the reading advocated in v. 3 by Mr. Paley and suggested *inter alia* by Mr. Blaydes—<οὐκ ἔσθ'> ὅποιον οὐχὶ νῶν ζώσαν τελεί—has long seemed to me pretty certainly right.

What I have said in this *Review* (vi. 73) about v. 24 needs some correction. Two glosses, χρησθεὶς δικαίῳ καὶ νόμῳ and κατὰ χθονός, have indeed been used to make v. 24 (they were mistaken by some one for a verse accidentally omitted and then added in the margin, because they happened to scan as a trimeter); but κατὰ χθονός was a gloss on χθονί, which once stood at the end of v. 25. The word νεκροῖς at the end of v. 25 (in its traditional form) is due to a gloss νεκρόν on νέκυν in v. 25. It is to be noticed that v. 26 is spatially just about the length of the word νέκυν longer than v. 25. The position of the gloss νεκρόν just after χθονί at the end of v. 25 would aid the process of corruption. I subjoin what I conceive to have been approximately the condition of the text of vv. 23-26 with the glosses.

χρησθεὶς δικαίῳ  
Ἐτεοκλέα μὲν, ὡς λέγουσιν, σὺν δίκῃ καὶ νόμῳ  
κατὰ χθονός  
ἔκρυψε τοῖς ἔνερθεν ἔντιμον χθονί, νεκρόν  
τὸν δ' ἀθλίως θανάτῳ Πολυνείκους νέκυν.

M. Tournier gives the right text, only he does not rightly explain how the present text arose, but talks of a 'glose νεκροῖς à

χρονί, qui a été l'origine de l'interpolation'. However, it is to M. Tournier's note that I owe indirectly this fuller explanation of the genesis of the present text.

In v. 33 should we not read ταῦτα in the place of ταῦτα?

In v. 38 εὐγενής and ἐσθλὼν κακή are not properly contrasted terms. Properly contrasted would be εὐγενής and δυσγενής, or ἐσθλὼν ἐσθλή (or equivalent) and ἐσθλὼν κακή. This brings us to the original form of the verse:

εἴτ' ἐγγενὴς πέφυκας εἴτ' ἐσθλὼν κακή.

The parodos of the *Antigone* is unfortunately considerably mutilated. It seems pretty certain that the anapaests balanced, or rather that the anapaests are practically part of the strophes, as Mr. Tyrrell prints them in his *Parnassus Library* text. Vv. 157 and 161 are both defective, as well as v. 112. It is quite possible too that there were several 'strophic rhymes' in vv. 100-162 that do not appear in the present form of the verses. Thus in vv. 136 sq. βακχεύων ἀνέμων | ῥίπαις ἐχθίστων ἐπένει may have been the original arrangement of the words in order to balance ἐκ μὲν δὴ πολέμων | τῶν νῦν θέσθε λημοσύναν (150 sq.). So too the reading of L in v. 157, ἐλέλιζων, inclines one to suppose that in v. 139 μέγας Ἄρης στυφέλιζων was the original order of the words. (Of the restoration of v. 117 I have spoken elsewhere: see *Class. Rev.* ix. (1895), p. 15, and *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.* xxviii., *Proceedings*, pp. xi.-xiv.)

In v. 320 there are at least two points of interest. First, δῆλον is unsatisfactory grammatically. The interlocking of the words—the hyperbatic arrangement—is plain. We have surely the common idiom of δῆλος with εἶναι and a participle. We shall thus accept the reading δῆλος of Aug. b. The gender of the participle ἐκπεφυκός is not strange. It is due merely to attraction to the predicate substantive—a common enough phenomenon. We come now to the question what that predicate noun was as Sophocles wrote it. Professor Campbell decided (with Messrs. Blaydes, Jebb and Tyrrell) in favour of λάλημα, adding to the citation of Eur. *Androm.* 937: 'And this word fits more closely to the context of the present passage. "Fie, 'tis too clear you are a born chatterbox." "Then it is clear that I never did this deed." But this is to use a false interpretation of v. 321 to support a reading in v. 320. For v. 321 means—Reiske's γ' for δ' after τό can hardly

but be right—'without having ever done that deed at all events.' Against the idiom of this verse (for which cf. *O.C.* 651, 848, 924; Plat. *Euthyd.* 283 C, 285 E) Professor Tyrrell's conjectural reading οὐκὼν τό γ' ἔργον τοῦδ' ὁ ποιήσας ποτέ sins quite as much as Professor Campbell's translation. Is there then not good reason for accepting as the Sophoclean form of these two verses (320 sq.) this?—

—οὔμ' ὥς ἀλημα δῆλος ἐκπεφυκός εἴ.

—οὐκ οὖν τό γ' ἔργον τοῦτο ποιήσας ποτέ.

(CREON. What a born knave you are!

GUARD. Without having ever done that deed at all events.)

That from Creon's point of view ἀλημα connotes sophistical cunning, from the Guard's criminality, is not against this interpretation. (See Xenophon on ὕβρις in *Anab.* 5. 8, 3.)

It may be added that in Eur. *Androm.* 937, quoted by Professor Campbell, there is good reason in the sequence of ideas to regard the verse as made up of two expressions closely related in meaning and to read:—

στοφὼν πανούργων, ποικίλων ἀλημάτων.

The scholiast on the passage in the *Antigone*, it may be added, interprets ἀλημα (as he read) by πανούργος.

The first antistrophe (342-352) of the splendid πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ chorus contains a famous crux. I venture to think that the combined acumen of Hermann and Semitélos has restored the original form of vv. 349-352, though it seems not to be commonly so thought. I hazard a short discussion of this famous passage. To do it justice we must consider the first antistrophe as a whole. This antistrophe, like the strophe, falls into two portions closely related to each other but clearly distinguished. The division falls at the same place in each. As in the strophe vv. 332-337 (πολλὰ—οἰδμασιν), or, excluding the introductory words πολλὰ—πέλει, vv. 334-337 (τοῦτο—οἰδμασιν), deal with man's commerce with the sea; vv. 338-342 (θεῶν τε—πολεῦον), with his commerce with the land: so in the antistrophe vv. 343-348 (κουφονόων τε—ἀνῆρ) deal with the capture of birds, beasts and fishes (I note that Professor Tyrrell's ἀγρεῖ is probably right); vv. 349-353 (κρατεῖ δέ—ταῦρον) with the taming of beasts (see the schol. and Semitélos on v. 349). περὶ ὧν ὑπ' οἰδμασιν is answered by περὶ φραδῆς ἀνῆρ and ἱππεῖσι.

γένει πολέων by οὐρείον τ' ἀδμήτα ταῦρον. (My reason for preferring the reading πολέων to πολέων is thus plain; of ἀδμήτα as opposed to ἀκμήτα I shall speak presently.) Now if, in the second half of the antistrophe, the part that deals with the taming of beasts, we keep the traditional text, we shall have the words κρατεῖ—ὄρεσσιβάτα explained by λασιυχενά θ'—ταῦρον. But ἵππον and ταῦρον are evidently but species of the genus ἀγραύλου θηρὸς ὄρεσσιβάτα, and we should, therefore, expect the substantives expressing the two species to be in apposition with the substantive expressing the genus, not the sentence containing the names of the species to be in apposition with the sentence containing the name of the genus. Professor Semitelos has escaped the difficulty (rightly, I think) by writing

κρατεῖ δὲ μηχαναῖς ἀγραύλους  
θήρας ὄρεσσιβάτας,

But this correction is reciprocally related to the correction of v. 351 sq. Here Hermann, accepting the reading ἔξεταῖ as containing merely an error due to pronunciation (I presume), proposed to read ἵππων (for ἵππον, in order to get —) ἔξέτε' ἀμφὶ λόφον ζυγοί. Hermann's defence of ἔξέτε' seems to me pretty satisfactory, and it is accepted by Professor Semitelos; but ἵππων will hardly stand. Here Professor Semitelos again comes to the rescue and finishes his good work by the neat supplement δν after ἵππον. Thus we read our appositives

λασιυχενά θ'  
ἵππων, <δν> ἔξέτε' ἀμφὶ λόφον ζυγοί,  
οὐρείον τ' ἀδμήτα ταῦρον.

Professor Semitelos does not indeed accept ἀδμήτα; but it seems to me that after κρατεῖ μηχαναῖς and ζυγοί he should have preferred a word that meant 'untamed,' 'unbroken', to one that meant merely 'unwielded', 'strong'.

Professor Blass's discussion of the πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ chorus in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher* for 1897 (pp. 477-480, *Zu Sophokles' Antigone und Platons Protagoras*) is worthy of attention, though it does its eminent author no great credit. I venture briefly to criticise it here.

Professor Blass sets out to show that the word παρείρων in the second antistrophe (v. 368) is sound. To do so he begins at the beginning of the second antistrophe (σοφὸν τι τὸ μηχανόεν κτέ.). The first sentence of his argument seems to call for some com-

ment: 'der vers *τοτὲ μὲν* usw. ist, wie Sauppe zu Plat. Prot. 344<sup>a</sup> anmerkt, dem dort citierten verse eines unbekannten dichters nachgebildet: αὐτὰρ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς τοτὲ μὲν κακός, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐσθλός.' It might appear from Professor Blass's language as though he thought that Sauppe had been the first to point out this connection. But in the Erfurdt-Hermann edition of the *Antigone* of 1830, of which I have used not only my own copy but one that bears on the fly-leaf Sauppe's signature as 'studios. philol. Lips. 1830', the note on v. 364 contains the addition by Erfurdt: 'Poetae obversatus videtur Theognidis locus, quem laudant Xenophon. Mem. I. 2, 20. et Plato Protag. p. 589. Heind.' To this Hermann adds: 'Versum, quem dicit Erfurdtius, αὐτὰρ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς τοτὲ μὲν κακός, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐσθλός, alius potius quam Theognidis esse, ex Xenophonte colligi potest'. It can hardly be regarded as proof of any internal connection between the *Protagoras* and the *Antigone*, if we find the same 'familiar quotation' in each work in different contexts, especially as this same 'familiar quotation' appears in Xenophon in still another context as a favourite saying of Socrates. The coincidence is such that it proves nothing for Professor Blass.

But he goes on to cite Prot. 320 C sqq. in proof of a striking similarity between Sophocles and Protagoras 'oder Platon—man weisz ja nicht, wie viel etwa der Sophist in der schrift *περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ καταστάσεως* hier... von selbst vorgetragen hatte—' in the account of the development of civilisation. τέχνη, he says in effect, is the key-note of both passages, and in the *Antigone* we are to understand with παρείρων the words εἰς τὴν τέχνην, the participle having the sense of 'einfügend in, verbindend mit'. One must be forgiven for thinking of Nestor's words of mild surprise in B 80-81. But let us examine this matter of similarity. Surely the difference between the two passages is quite as striking as the similarity. In Plato Epimetheus leaves mankind ἀκόσμητον, so that the theft of fire by Prometheus is necessary in order that man may obtain the ἐντεχνος σοφία; ἀμήχανον γὰρ ἦν, says Protagoras, ἀνευ πυρὸς αὐτὴν κτητὴν τῷ ἡ χρησίμην γενέσθαι. The πολιτικὴ τέχνη was with Zeus, into whose citadel Prometheus was no longer allowed to enter;<sup>1</sup> therefore he could do no more than go into the common workshop of Hephaestus and Athena—

<sup>1</sup> Why, we are not told. Is there here a trace of the tale of the Lost Paradise? and have the Διὸς φυλακαὶ (321 D) anything to do with Genesis 3, 24?

eviden  
then  
τὴν τοῖ  
Thus  
tween  
pursue  
I wis  
corrup  
others  
διὰ τῇ  
canno  
συντεχ  
fairly  
hazar  
(viii.  
sugges  
regard  
here;  
haps  
form o  
θείαν  
produc  
has be  
have s  
(by su  
To  
in Pr  
'fire-s  
of wh  
a relig  
and p  
vate l  
πολιτι  
soon a  
which  
πολεμι  
πολιτι  
gregat  
buildi  
one a  
πολιτι  
Poor h  
plight  
which  
But  
chorus  
wonde  
more  
himsel  
the se  
great  
He cat  
the wi  
tames  
himsel  
come f

<sup>1</sup> We  
Protag  
primitiv



evidently in the lower town!—and steal thence for man's behoof *τὴν τε ἔμπυρον τέχνην τὴν τοῦ Ἡφαίστου καὶ τὴν ἄλλην τὴν τῆς Ἀθηνῶν*. Thus far there is surely no parallel between Plato and Sophocles. But before we pursue our examination of this matter further, I wish to say something about a textual corruption that Professor Blass—with others—has tried to get rid of. The words *διὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ συγγένειαν* in *Prot.* 322 A cannot be right. Whether Professor Blass's *συντεχνίαν* for *συγγένειαν* helps matters, may fairly be doubted. Some time ago I hazarded a correction in the *Classical Review* (viii. p. 11), viz. *διὰ τοῦτο*, and tried to suggest the motive of the corruption. In regard to the motive I have nothing to add here; but I venture to suggest what is perhaps a better conjecture of the original form of the words, viz. *δι' αὐτήν* (i.e. *διὰ τὴν θεῖαν μοῖραν*). If this conjecture really reproduces the manus Platonica, the passage has been corrupted either by a gloss (as I have suggested) or by a fancied correction (by supplement) after the loss of *Υ*.

To return to the parallelism, we find that in Protagoras-Plato man, gifted with the 'fire-skill' and thus in possession of a part of what belongs to the gods,<sup>1</sup> first invented a religion, then began to speak, to prepare and procure houses and furniture, to cultivate husbandry. But since men had not *πολιτικὴ τέχνη*, they dwelt separate and were soon almost destroyed by wild beasts, against which they could not wage war, because the *πολεμικὴ τέχνη* is a part of the lacking *πολιτικὴ τέχνη*. Thus men began to congregate and seek to protect themselves by building cities. But they trespassed against one another, because they had not the *πολιτικὴ τέχνη*, and were soon again scattered. Poor humanity is at length rescued from its plight by Zeus's gift of *αἰδώς* and *δίκη*, in which every man must have his share.

But what has all this to do with the chorus in the *Antigone*? There are many wonderful things, says the poet, but none more wonderful than man. He devotes himself to perilous navigation (is master of the sea). He wearsies by ploughing the great goddess Earth (is master of the land). He catches in nets the nimble-witted birds, the wild beasts, the fishes in the sea. He tames the horse and the bull. He taught himself (and here in the second strophe we come for the first time on something the

least bit like chronological development<sup>2</sup>)—he taught himself speech, thought, liking to live in towns, building of houses. All resources has he in himself; nothing future, save death, will he encounter helpless; even remedies for overwhelming diseases has he devised. With all this wonderful capability man turns sometimes to evil, sometimes to good, in the latter case loyal to the laws and to his oath,<sup>3</sup> standing thus high in the state: a man without a country is he whose boldness makes that which is not beautiful—evil—to dwell with him (i.e., as the chiasmus shows, he that *ἐπὶ κακὸν ἔρπει*): may none that does such things (that *τὰ μὴ καλὰ ἔρπει τόλμας χάριν*) be either neighbour or fellow-partisan of mine.

Where the 'enge berührung zwischen dem Protagoras und der Antigone' is to be found in the passages compared, I for one cannot discern. A connection between Protagoras's *μῦθος* and the Orphic poem quoted by Sextus Empiricus (see Professor Blass's article, p. 478) is more probable perhaps but is not proved.<sup>4</sup>

A marked difference between Protagoras's tale and the chorus in the *Antigone* consists in this, that in Sophocles the independent activity of man is dwelt upon; nothing is said of supernatural interference. This Professor Blass ignores.

Professor Blass's attempt to smuggle the word *τέχνη* into the first antistrophe of the chorus in the *Antigone*,<sup>5</sup> in order to make it the subject of the second strophe, should be considered a lamentable failure. Albeit *ἐδιδάξατο* seems to be found only here in the sense of 'taught himself', yet that is justified, as Matthiae saw,<sup>6</sup> by the circum-

<sup>2</sup> If we seek to see chronological development earlier in this passage, we shall find man ploughing with the *ἵππειον γένος* before he has tamed the *ἵππος*.

<sup>3</sup> What Sophocles wrote where *πατεῖρων* stands may not be absolutely certain, but I believe that Professor Jebb is right in thinking that Reiske's *γαλαίων* is it. The word *πληρῶν* in the scholion to v. 368 cannot well be a corruption of *πατεῖρων*. But *πατεῖρων* in the text might come from *γαλαίων*, or from *πληρῶν* unclearly written as a gloss on *γαλαίων*. At all events the righteous man is intended to be described as *νόμιμος καὶ ἐνορκος*. Professor Blass seems to have misunderstood *θεῶν ἐνορκον δίκαν* = *θεῶν ἔρκους*. (With *πατεῖρων* for *γαλαίων*, cf. *παρόντα* for *γέροντα*, *O. T.* 971.)

<sup>4</sup> The *μῦθος* as Protagoras relates it has, as Professor Blass notes, no strict logical sequence. In this Plato may have wished to parody his sophist's naïveté. Whether this be so or not, the story is certainly naïve. If an 'Orphic' poem underlies the *μῦθος*, it in turn will have been based on a primitive legend.

<sup>5</sup> By reading *ἵππον ἔχει τέχνη ἀμφίλοφον ζυγόν*.

<sup>6</sup> *Gr. Gramm.* 496, 8 *ad fin.* ('Media statt der Passiva'), 'Soph. *Ant.* 364 καὶ φθέγμα—ἐδιδάξατο, wo

<sup>1</sup> We find here, as Professor Blass remarks, in Protagoras's tale a very clumsy attempt at connecting primitive art and primitive worship.



stances of the case. Man 'invented', or, more forcibly, he 'taught himself.' *ἤπερο* would come nearest, perhaps, to *εἰδιδάξατο* here, but would not nearly so well express Sophocles's meaning. *ἐνυπέφραστοι* = 'has devised', seems still more easily justified. Indeed, is either of these words more surprising than *αὐτοφώρων* = 'which he caught himself perpetrating' (*Ant.* 51)? and has not Sophocles—in the spirit of the higher Greek poetry—oftentimes strained a word or phrase—enriched its connotation at the expense of its denotation?

It would thus appear that Professor Blass's <πόρ> after *πάγων* is an infelicitous, as well as needless, conjecture. What Sophocles wrote here cannot, perhaps, be said with certainty. One may content himself with <ὕτ>*αἰδρεία* (or <ὕτ>*αἰδρία*) as possibly right. (Palaeographically better is the *δυσάθεια* of the Campbell and Abbott edition.)

Though a connexion cannot be made out between Protagoras's myth and *Ant.* 332–375, yet it is possible that the passage in the *Protagoras* where the quotation from the old poet occurs may have something to do with that chorus. In the chorus in the *Antigone* near the end of the second strophe stand the words *νόσων ἀμηχάνων* in the sense of 'overwhelming diseases'; near the beginning of the second antistrophe stands the reminiscence of the old poet. In *Prot.* 344 C we find the words *ὃν ἂν ἀμήχανος συμφορά καθέλη* quoted from Simonides and followed by an exposition of the term *ἀμήχανος* = *ἀμήχανον ποιῶν*, 'overwhelming', as there used. Three classes of *ἐμύχανοι* are cited as rendered *ἀμήχανοι* by *ἀμήχανοι συμφοραί*—the skipper, the farmer, the physician. 'For the good can become bad as well, as is witnessed by another poet, who said: *αὐτὰρ—ισθλός*.' If this is more than mere coincidence, Plato may in writing the passage just quoted have had the chorus of the *Antigone* in mind. But this is a mere possibility.

A feature of *Ant.* 332–375 that has an important bearing on the interpretation of that passage both in whole and in part is the duality that runs through it, of which I have already cited a striking instance. But not only have we seamanship and husbandry, capture of the lower animals and taming of the lower animals coupled (vv. 335–353); we find speech and thought, town-inhabiting temper and building of houses,

nach dem gewöhnlichen Sprachgebrauch *εἰδιδάχθη* stehen sollte. Aber *εἰδιδάχθη* heisst, er lernte von andern passive, *εἰδιδάξατο*, er lernte durch eigne Thätigkeit'.

frost and rain, resourcefulness and resourcelessness, escape from death and escape from disease (vv. 354–364), evil and good, law and oath, civic dignity and civic disgrace, neighbour and partisan (vv. 365–375). The clear perception of this pairing of ideas in vv. 354–375 shows one that *φρόνημα* is sound, that *δοτυνόμους ὀργὰς* is also sound and has the simple meaning given above, and that *φεῦξιν* is probably sound. Professor Semitelos changes *φρόνημα*, *ὀργὰς* and *φεῦξιν*. *παρίσσις* seems pretty clearly = *παρούκος*, 'neighbour', and *ἰσον φρονῶν* = *συστασιώτης*. Local and political proximity are thus coupled.

Vv. 450–452.<sup>1</sup> Creon dismisses the guard (vv. 444 sq.) and turns to Antigone with the words *οὐ δ' εἶπέ μοι—μή μῆκος, ἀλλὰ συντόμως—| ἥδησθα κερυχθέντα μὴ ποιεῖν τάδε*; (Here Cobet's *ἥδησθα* is certainly right. But the explanation given by Messrs. Wolff-Bellermann, Jebb and Humphreys of the construction of *κερυχθέντα* I venture to think wrong. *κερυχθέντα μὴ ποιεῖν* = *ἀπορρηθέντα κερύγματι*. The participle is not impersonal but agrees with *τάδε*.) Antigone answers: *ἥδη τί δ' οὐκ ἐμελλον; ἐμφανὴ γὰρ ἦν* (sc. *κερυχθέντα μὴ ποιεῖν τάδε*). Then Creon: *καὶ δὴτ' ἐτόλμας τοῖσδ' ὑπερβαίνειν νόμους*; Antigone: *οὐ γὰρ τί μοι Ζεὺς ἦν ὁ κηρύξας τάδε | οὐδ' ἡ ξύνουκος τῶν κάτω θεῶν Δίκη, | οἱ τοῖσδ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ὤρισαν νόμους*; | *οὐδὲ σθένεις τοσούτον ὠμόμηρ τὰ σὰ | κηρύγμαθ' ὥστ' ἄγραπτα* (possibly *ὡς τὰγραπτα* with Brunek and Aug. b) *κἀσφαλὴ θεῶν | νόμματα δύνασθα θητόν ὄνθ' ὑπερβαλεῖν κτλ.* If we construe Antigone's answer as is customary, we begin: 'Yes; for from my point of view it was not at all Zeus that proclaimed this'. The next verse would then naturally mean 'nor was it that Justice that dwells with the nether gods'. But the next verse would then mean 'who (referring to Zeus and Δίκη) defined these laws for mankind'. *τοῖσδε νόμοις* here ought to mean the same thing as *τοῖσδε νόμοις* in v. 449. But this is absurd—at least it is generally so considered. Prof. Campbell does not find it so. \* He annotates: 'The iteration of *τοῖσδε*, in contrasting the law which she obeyed with the edict of Creon, is dramatically appropriate, and there is no difficulty in the vague use of the demonstrative'. Similarly Wolff-Bellermann: '*τοῖσδε νόμοις* mit deutlicher scharfer Beziehung auf Kreon's Worte 449'. In their Critical Appendix (5th ed.) we read further: 'Durch

<sup>1</sup> The following note was read before the American Philological Association at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., 6 July, 1898.

Valo  
Konj  
beab  
νόμου  
major  
sible  
νόμου  
Wolff  
befor  
gener  
turn  
neces  
As I  
almos  
Zeus  
must  
certa  
us see  
all in  
thing  
dwell  
Justic  
laws  
amon  
ὤρισαν  
νόμου  
τοῖσδε  
natur  
is sub  
and r  
believ  
I am  
Erfun  
somev  
from  
1830  
disple  
intelli  
paullo  
menti  
Polyn  
video  
verba  
dicitur  
quibus  
negavi  
quo ju  
Itaque  
admiss  
Xenop  
οἱ ἐν π  
πάν το  
terrari  
193 p  
lapsu

<sup>1</sup> It is  
sage in  
follows:  
νόμους;  
νομισμέ

Valckenaers fast allgemein aufgenommene Konjekture *τοιούσδ' ἐν—ᾧρισεν νόμους* wird die beabsichtigte Zurückbeziehung auf *τούσδε νόμους* 449 zerstört'. I must agree with the majority that the traditional text is indefensible here on account of the preceding *τούσδε νόμους* and that Prof. Campbell and Messrs. Wolff and Bellermaun are wrong. But before dealing directly with Valckenaer's generally received conjecture I wish to return to v. 450 and to ask whether it is necessary to make *Zeüs* the subject of *ἦν*. As I read the verse, and as it seems to me almost, if not quite, necessary to read it, *Zeüs* cannot be taken as subject of *ἦν*, but must be predicate. My feeling for Greek certainly imperatively demands this. Let us see what this leads to. 'Yes; for not at all in my eyes was the proclaimer of these things *Zeüs*, nor (was he) that Justice that dwells with the nether gods, who (*Zeüs* and Justice)—did what? Not 'defined these laws among mankind', but 'defined the laws among mankind': not *τούσδ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις ᾧρισαν νόμους*, but *τοὺς ἐν ἀνθρώποις ᾧρισαν νόμους*. Some scribe under the influence of *τούσδ' ὑπερβαίνειν νόμους* (449) made the natural blunder *τούσδ'* for *τοὺς* here. This is substantially the course of interpretation and reasoning by which I arrived at what I believe Sophocles to have written here. But I am not the first to suggest this reading. Erfurdt had already reached the same result somewhat differently. I quote his note from the Erfurdt-Hermann *Antigone* of 1830: 'Vulgo *τούσδ'*, quod mihi etiamnum displicet. Quum enim *τούσδε νόμους* non intelligi possit nisi de iis legisbus, quarum pautello ante vv. 443, 445 [= 447, 449] mentio facta erat, nominatim de edicto, quo Polynicem sepeliri vetuerat Creon, haud video equidem, qua ratione conveniant ista verba cum antecedentibus. Quippe sic dicitur ea lex Deorum niti auctoritate, a quibus constitutum esse *Antigona* modo negavit. Deinde quae Thebanis data fuerat, quo jure *ἐν ἀνθρώποις* condita vocari potest? Itaque non dubito scribendum esse *τοὺς*, quo admissio οἱ *ἐν ἀνθρώποις νόμοι*, ut cum Xenophonte Memor. iv. 4, 19, loquar, sunt οἱ *ἐν πάσῃ χώρᾳ κατὰ τὰν νόμιζόμενοι*. Sic πᾶν τὸ *ἐν ἀνθρώποις* χροσίων, in toto orbe terrarum, Xenoph. Ages. 8, 6. Supra v. 193 pro τῶν August. b. et Dresd. a. pari lapsu τῶνδ' exhibent.<sup>1</sup> That is an admirable

<sup>1</sup> It is worth while more fully to compare the passage in the *Memorabilia* cited by Erfurdt. It is as follows: Ἀγάρφους δὲ τινὰς οἰσθα, ἐφη, ὃ ἱππία, νόμους; τοὺς γ' ἐν πάσῃ, ἐφη, χώρᾳ κατὰ τὰν νόμιζόμενους.—The τῶνδ' in v. 193 (which is the

statement, so far as it goes. Let us turn now to Valckenaer's famous conjecture.

This rests on two assumptions: (1) That *Zeüs* is the subject of *ἦν*; (2) That *τούσδε νόμους* in v. 452 must mean the same thing as *τούσδε νόμους* in v. 449. Of these assumptions I believe (1) to be wrong and (2) to be right. I am sorry that the argument against (1) is so intangible. If both assumptions are right (as I deny them to be), then Valckenaer's conjecture *τοιούσδ'—ᾧρισεν νόμους* rises to the dignity of an emendation. Mr. Jebb (no sure guide in such matters) says it 'is a certainly true correction'. It involves, it may be noted in passing, two changes, that of οἱ *τούσδ'* to *τοιούσδ'* (to my mind a rather violent change) and that of *ᾧρισαν* to *ᾧριεν*. The scholion ἡ Δίκη, φησί, καὶ ὁ *Zeüs* ᾧρισαν ὥστε θάπτεσθαι τοὺς νεκρούς could be an explanation of Erfurdt's text; it could also be an explanation, as it is generally supposed to be, of the traditional text.

Erfurdt's reading involves an interesting question to which I shall presently refer. But before doing so, I wish to speak of another reading that has been proposed in v. 452. This differs from that of Erfurdt only in a minute detail, viz. in substituting *τοὺς γ'* for *τούσδ'*. This was proposed by Professor Semitélos independently—ἐξ ἐμῆς διορθώσεως, as he expresses it—but had been anticipated by Vauvilliers. Though Professor Semitélos thinks the γ' is not otiose (ἀργόν) but περιέχει τινὰ εἰρωνείαν καὶ περὶ τὴν ἀμύζουσαν ἐνταῦθα, I fail to see its force. As we have seen, *τοὺς* in place of *τούσδ'* is easily justified.

The interesting question alluded to above has to do with the reference of the relative οἱ. I have already explained it as referring to *Zeüs* and *Δίκη*; but it may be said (the objection has already been made by Boeckh and not well answered by Mr. Semitélos) that it should be *Zeüs* and ἡ ξύνουλκος τῶν κάτω θεῶν *Δίκη* and that it cannot rightly be said that *Zeüs* and this special phase of *Δίκη* (discussed by Mr. Semitélos in his explanatory notes) defined the laws of mankind. It is not enough to answer with Mr. Semitélos that the context shows that *Antigone* has in mind only burial-laws. That is simply not true, it seems to me. The answer is a simple one, I believe, but quite different, viz. that here, as elsewhere, the relative clause regards the antecedent noun in its most general sense,

reading of L) is due to τῶνδ' immediately above it in v. 192

not in the modified sense that it bears where it stands. This is not an isolated phenomenon. The tendency to gravitate, by a sort of centripetal force, from the specific to the generic, as a sentence lengthens out, may be amply illustrated in Greek and need not be dwelt upon here, nor need we glance at ὅστις. For the simple relative clause I will bring forward a few examples. Others are doubtless to be found. I do not know of any adequate—in fact of any—discussion of the phenomenon. Thus in *Ai.* 463–5 Ajax says πῶς με τλήσεται (Telamon) ποτ' εἰσιδεῖν | γυμνὸν φανέντα τῶν ἀριστείων ἄτερ, | ὦν αὐτὸς ἔσχε στέφανον εὐκλείας μέγαν; Here τῶν ἀριστείων means specifically the arms of Achilles, ὦν means ἀριστείων generally, as is recognized in the Schneidewin-Nauck note: 'ὦν wird angeschlossen als ob Aias nicht τῶν ἀριστείων, sondern allgemein ἀριστείων gesagt hätte.' In Euripides's *Andromache* Andromache reports that Hermione says of her that she wishes to dwell in Neoptolemus's house in her stead ἐκβαλοῦσα λέκτρα τάκεινης (sc. Ἑρμιόνης) βίαι, | ἀγὼ τὸ πρόσθεν οὐχ ἔκοῦσ' ἐδεξάμην, | νῦν δ' ἐκλείοιπα (vv. 35–37). Here the αἰ in ἀγὼ refers not to λέκτρα τάκεινης but to λέκτρα meaning Andromache's relations with Neoptolemus. In Plato *Protag.* 357 E we read ὥστε τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὸ ἡδονῆς ἥττω εἶναι, ἀμαθία ἢ μεγίστη, ἥς (sc. ἀμαθίας in general, not merely ἀμαθίας τῆς μεγίστης) Πρωταγόρας οὕτως φησὶν ἰατρὸς εἶναι κτέ. So Lysias 7, 18 πῶς ἂν οἷός τ' ἢ πάντας πείσαι τοὺς παριόντας ἢ τοὺς γείτονας (my neighbours), οἱ (neighbours in general) οὐ μόνον ἀλλήλων ταῦτ' ἴσασι αἰ πᾶσι ὁρᾶν ἔξεστιν, κτέ.: Lys. 32, 24 τὸ ἡμῖν τοῖτοιοι ὀρφανοῖς οὖσι λελόγισται, οὖς (orphans in general) ἢ πόλις οὐ μόνον παῖδας ὄντας ἀτελεῖς ἐποίησαν (makes), ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπειδὴν δοκιμασθῶσιν ἐνιαυτὸν ἀφῆκεν ἀπασῶν τῶν λητουργῶν: Isaeus 1, 13 καὶ τεκμηρίους χρῆσθαι μὴ τοῖς μετ' ὀργῆς πραχθεῖσιν (by Cleonymus), ἐν οἷς (acts of anger in general) ἀπαντες πεφύκαμεν ἀμαρτάνειν, κτέ. I close this discussion with a Latin example (the only one I have at hand) from Justin (8, 2): et externae dominationi, quam (sc. dominationem, not externam dominationem) in suis timuerunt, sponte succedunt.

In v. 540 Mr. Blaydes has already suggested what I venture to think is the right reading: ἀλλ' ἐν κακοῖσι σοῖσιν οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι. The verse is somewhat like Eur. *Alc.* 318, where I am glad to see that Mr. Hayley agrees with me in upholding οὐτ' ἐν τόκοισι σοῖσι θαρσύνει, τέκνον.

Boeckh's support of the assignment of v. 572 to *Antigone* is a noteworthy instance of the invasion of classical philology by sentimental bad taste. That vv. 754 and 576 should also go to Ismene is reasonably certain. The symmetry of the passage alone seems to demand it. It is possible that the verses between 571 and 575 have been disarranged and should be read in this order (I prefix vv. 569 sq. because v. 570 seems to need a slight correction by punctuation):

KP.	ἀρώσιμοι γὰρ χατέρων εἰσὶν γύαι.	569
IC.	οὐχ' ὥς γ' ἐκείνῳι τῇδε τ' ἦν ἡρμοσμένα.	570
KP.	ἄγαν γε λυπείς καὶ σὺ καὶ τὸ σὺν λέχος.	573
IC.	ἦ γὰρ στερήσεις τῆσδε τὸν σαντοῦ γόνον;	574
KP.	κακὸς ἐγὼ γυναῖκας υἱέσιν στυγῶ.	571
IC.	ὦ φίλταθ' Αἴμον, ὥς σ' ἀτιμάζει πατήρ.	572
KP.	Αἰδὼς ὁ παύσων τοῖσδε τοὺς γάμους ἔφν.	575

One cannot wonder that a woman of Antigone's temper fairly loathes Ismene. For all that, in this scene Sophocles has given us a masterly characterisation of a certain sort of mawkish sentimentality—a characterisation as true to the life as it is disgusting.

In v. 593 may not ἀρχαῖα τὰ Λαβδακιδῶν (so E) ὀρῶμαι οἰκῶν (balancing v. 582 εὐδαίμονες οἷσι κακῶν ἀγευστος αἰὼν) be what Sophocles wrote?

In vv. 599 sqq. unless we read <δ> τέτατο θάλος and ἀμαὶ κοπῆς the words λόγον τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν Ἑρινύς would seem fitly to characterize the words of the chorus rather than the conduct of the heroine.

Though it is not my intention to defend here the authenticity of v. 904 sqq., I venture to remark that the verses are not so bad as they have been often said to be. Professor Semitelos has rightly, I venture to think, corrected εἰ τέκνων μήτηρ ἔφν to εἰ τέκν', ὦν μήτηρ ἔφν, in v. 905. V. 912 seems to have given Aristotle no trouble—if the MSS. are to be trusted. In v. 904 I think it may be fairly asked whether the traditional text would not mean 'and yet it was I that honoured you in the eyes of right-thinking people.' If that be so, we should accept, as Mr. Blaydes has done, Arndt's καίτοι σέ γ' εὖ τίμησα τοῖς φρονούσιν εὖ 'and yet I certainly (γ') did right in honouring you in the eyes of right-thinking people.' And here I may remark that in *O.T.* 597 the

emphasis seems to be in favour of Musgrave's αικάλλουσι as against the traditional ἐκαλοῦσι. (I find that Meineke takes up this point much as I have done in the *Analecta Sophoclea* appended to his edition of the *Oedipus Coloneus*.) 'Now by all am I greeted, now all salute me, now those that want something from you,—if we keep ἐκαλοῦσι, a word of essentially different meaning from the two others used of Creon and rather contrasted with χροίζουσι, we must, I think, read ἐκαλλοῦσ' ἐμέ; but if we read αικάλλουσι we have a third verb of

similar meaning with the other two used of Creon and forming a climax with them and, furthermore, not requiring the emphatic form of the pronoun (for which there is no manuscript warrant) in place of με. Aristotle *rhet.* 1371 *a* says καὶ τὸ κολακεύεσθαι καὶ ὁ κόλαξ ἡδύς· φαινόμενος γὰρ θαυμαστῆς καὶ φαινόμενος φίλος ὁ κόλαξ ἐστίν. Does not this defend αικάλλουσι from the Greek point of view?

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Barnard College.

# ON SOME PASSAGES IN PROPERTIUS.

[CORPUS TEXT, 1894].

## 1. ii. 34<sup>b</sup>, 29—30.

Aut quid Crethei tibi prosunt carmina  
plectri?

Nil iuuat in magno uester amore senex.

Crethei Ω erecthei v(mg.)μ [N has Erechti] plectri Palm. lecta Ω.

I quote from Dr. Postgate's critical note. These vv. are generally connected with ii. 34, 1—26, addressed to Lynceus, a friend of the poet.

The data to determine the reading in v. 29 are perhaps too slight to make for certainty. But it is plain that erecthei of v μ is only an emendation of N's reading *Erechti*, which N and v would derive from their common source (Housman, *J. Ph.*, xxi., p. 103). It has been suggested that *Erechti* itself is a disarrangement of the letters of *Crethei* (Housman, *ibid.* p. 155). The reference would be then either to Epimenides or to Homer (whose mother was *Cretheis*). In favour of the latter is v. 45 below and i. 9, 11, plus in amore ualet Mimnermi uersus Homero.

But another suggestion may be worth making; that, namely, both *Crethei* and *Erechti* are corruptions, independently, of *Aratei*.

Aratus, the astronomer-poet of Soli, in Cilicia, had obtained an importance in literature which may seem strange to us considering his subject, to say nothing of the treatment. See Professor J. B. Mayor on Cic. N.D. ii. § 104. Professor Mayor rejects the reading *Arateis* there, but the form of the adj. is proved by two other passages in Cic.

The letter *e* is often confused with *a*. Thus at ii. 1, 66, N has Tantelea for Tanteleae, at ii. 29, 11, 24 at and et are variants. Then again *c* and *e* are confused *passim*. Thus the steps from *Aratei* to *Cretei* and to *Eretei* would be almost simultaneous. *t* before a vowel has often *h* appended: Therodamanthes Ω at i., 20, 6. Thus we have on the one hand *Crethei*; on the other *Erethei*, and the change of *e* to *c* and transposition does the rest without involving an 'anagram.'

The allusion to astronomy in vv. 51 *sq.* now becomes clear. If we assume that Lynceus is still referred to in the second person here then *uester* of v. 30 implies that he was also from Soli, which from his name (in that case not a pseudonym) he might well be.

*Plectri* is necessary in v. 30. Housman reading *Cretaei*—*plectri* compares Sil. 8, 596, *Smyrnaeis aemula plectris*; a parallel to *Aratei*—*plectri* may be found in Stat. Silv. i. 3, 101, *Pindaricis*—*plectris*.

## 2. iii. 7, 45—6.

uiuere ante suos dulcis conuiuia Penates,  
pauper at in terra nil nisi fleret opes.

So Postgate, after Bährens, in v. 46. I am not aware that Jacob's reading *nil ubi flare potest*, 'where blowing is of no avail,' has been supported by what seems a remarkable parallel: Lucretius, vi. 138 *sqq.*

Nam quid possit ibi flatus manifesta docet  
res;  
hic ubi lenior est in terra cum tamen alta  
arbusta euoluens radicibus hausit ab imis.



ibi = in the upper air; *nisi* (*n'*) is just as likely to be a correction of *ubi* (*u'*) as *vice-versa*.

3. iii. 7, 21—4.

iii. 18, 29—30.

I discuss these passages together as I contend that they were originally continuous. They are respectively

Sunt Agamemnonias testantia litora curas  
qua notat Argynni poena minantis aquae.  
hoc iuvene amisso classem non soluit  
Atrides,  
pro qua mactata est Iphigenia mora.

and

hic olim ignaros luctus populabat Achivos,  
Atridae magno cum stetit alter amor.

The first of these passages does not seem to belong to the elegy, that on Paetus, wherein it is embedded. Whether we put the scene of Argynnus' death (v. Dr. Postgate's note in his edition of 1885) on the East or the West of the Aegaeon, there is equally an absence of any point or reference to the case of Paetus, except—and this the detail of the passage does not favour—the circumstance that they were both young and both drowned. It is not here my province to criticise the text of these vv., but I would adopt Hertzberg's *Athamantiadae* in v. 22, thus preserving the usual form of the legend which made the river Cephissus in Boeotia the scene of Argynnus' death.

There is a similarly strong case for the view that dislocation has brought the second passage to its present place. Coming as it does in the middle of the elegy on Marcellus it disturbs the whole train of thought. The reference in *hic—luctus* is most obscure (v. again Dr. Postgate) and the point of the comparison—that the fatal malady was apparently causeless in the case of the Greeks as in that of Marcellus is considerably enfeebled when we remember that in the first instances multitudes were sent to Orcus, in the latter only one. If the poet wished to suggest that Apollo had slain Marcellus, whether violently or of *ἀγανοῖς βελέεσσιν ἐποικόμενος*, it is strange that he should compare his single case with that of many slain at once: also *ignaros* is rather ignorant of the cause why they were

slain than of the god who slew them (v. 8). Compare Iliad i. v. 64, where Achilles labours under no mistake.

It is, however, in the phrase *alter amor*, v. 30, that I find a proof of I think a most convincing kind. The connection of 29 and 30 suggests that the *alter amor*, the change in Agamemnon's heart, was the cause of the *luctus*. Now this makes the reference in these words clearly to Chryseis. But if Chryseis is *alter amor* who is *primus*? Argynnus, to whom the first passage refers.<sup>1</sup>

On the other view *alter amor* is Briseis. She did it is true cost Agamemnon dear, but in an entirely different way, and *later*. If Propertius meant to refer to Briseis he has most inartistically allowed us to think at one and the same moment of two quite disparate kinds of *luctus*; that which reflects the scene at the beginning of the Iliad and that which is set forth in its later books when the *μῆνις* has begun to work.

If the second passage follows directly after the first *hic luctus* is the grief of Agamemnon for Argynnus described in v. 3 of the first passage? I should say that the six lines as I assume them to be in unity belonged to a separate poem, though it is not difficult to find a place for them amid the copious mythological references of Propertius.

It may be noted in conclusion that vv. 37—8 of

ii. 1.

Theseus infernis, superis testatur Achilles,  
hic Ixioniden, ille Menoetiaden.

with similar motif of heroic friendships are also out of place where they are found. Are these part of the same context as those discussed?

4. iv. 7, 69.

Sic mortis lacrimis uitae sanamus amores.

Mortis is corrupt. I propose  
Sic moris; lacrimis, &c.

Moris is G. Sing. of *mos*, and we may translate 'Such is our wont'; cf. *ut Domitiano moris erat*, Tac. Agr. 39, where *ut* is voucher for *sic* with this idiom.

J. A. NAIRN.

<sup>1</sup> In conclusion then I agree with the view taken by Dr. Postgate (1885).



## QUIDEM IN AUGUSTAN VERSE.

I HAVE felt some curiosity as to the distribution of *quidem* in Augustan verse. The particle is felt to be mainly a colloquial one, and by far the greater number of instances quoted in the dictionaries come from the comedians and Cicero. L. and S. do not quote one instance from serious poetry. On the other hand, the useful index to the Delphin Vergil gives *quidem* 'passim'; though it quotes all the instances of *equidem*, which, as a matter of fact, is commoner. This is hardly satisfactory. I give here the result of my researches. I cannot, of course, absolutely guarantee that I have overlooked no single instance.

Vergil, once in the *Eclogues* (9, 37); eleven times in the *Georgics* (i. 126, 390; ii. 48, 125, 212; iii. 217, 501, 567; iv. 457, 489, 501); seven times in the *Aeneid*, nearly all in the later books (iii. 628; ix. 796; x. 385; xi. 49, 378; xii. 234, 808); also *quandoquidem* four times.

Horace, nowhere, I think, in *Odes* or *Epodes*; only five times in *Satires* and *Epistles*, namely, *Satt.* i. 10, 51; *Ep.* i. 2, 13, 9, 7; ii. 1, 43, 219.

Tibullus, thrice (i. 6, 7; ii. 4, 51; 5, 61), besides once in pseudo-Tib. (iv. 6, 5).

Propertius, four times (ii. 3, 39; 8, 28; iii. (iv), 12 (11), 9; 13 (12) 3).

Ovid, *Heroides* 1—15, thrice (4, 121; 6, 147; 10, 143); *Amores*, thrice (ii. 6, 36; 13, 3; iii. 7, 7; *Ars Amat.* seven times (i. 9, 235, 446, 681, 699; ii. 319; iii. 489). *Tristia*, eleven times (i. 1, 73, 123; ii. 29, 139, 241; iii. 4, 1; 12, 35; iv. 1, 66; 10, 61; v. 2, 55, 14, 29). *Metamorphoses*, i—iii., twelve times (i. 209, 438, 488, 519; ii. 434, 436, 593, 667, 822, 855; iii. 247, 557); *ibid.* xiii.—xv., seven times (xiii. 160, 493, 751; xiv. 188, 458; xv. 578, 598).

The general result is that the particle is not so rare in Augustan poetry as the dictionaries might perhaps lead one to expect. The commonest case is where the word comes as the second word in a line (ille *quidem*, *prima quidem*, &c.), simply emphasizing the first word. It often is clearly concessive, followed by *sed* or *tamen*. We find *ne . . . quidem* in Ov. *Her.*, 4, 121, &c.

E. S. THOMPSON.

A BODLEIAN MS. OF OVID'S *IBIS*.

Among the Canonici MSS. there is a late XVth or early XVIth century codex of the *Ibis* (Canon. 20), which hardly seems to have received sufficient attention. Prof. Ellis in his edition cites several good readings from it, especially l. 323 *aleuas*; but besides this it corrects 6 of the remaining 12 test passages put forward in his introduction ch. viii. p. liii.: these are ll. 84, 178, 256, 359, 513 and the omission of the interpolated distich after 130; in two it is nearer the right reading (l. 335 *passae*, 502 *thaleceae*), and in one it gives a fresh variant (600 *orpheon- esque satae*). There are also several readings for which I can find no parallel in the apparatus criticus either of Postgate's *Corpus Poetarum*, which I have used for my collation, or of Merkel's or Ellis's editions. Perhaps the most noticeable are ll. 30, 265, 292, 309, 337, 380, 404, 418, 450, 463, 510, 534, (and 540, 563 *sg.* which agree with Merkel's B.E. and d.g. respectively). At l. 245 the reading is *suae horae*, which appears

in the Aldine edition, but in no MSS. The order in which the lines are written is very remarkable; it is as follows:—1-14. 17, 18. 15, 6. 19-40. 43-6. 41, 42. 135-278. 339-438. 441-522 (tr. 471, 2 post 474, et om. 507. 8). 525, 6. 523, 4. 537, 8. 527, 8. 531, 2. 529, 30. 533, 4. 539, 40. 535, 6. 541-8. 563, 4. 549-62. 565-636. 279-328. 47-132. 329, 30. 439, 40. 461, 2. 331, 8. 637-44. But apparently the changes were made intentionally by the scribe, as at the end of several of the longer transpositions (ll. 278, 328, 132, 338) he places a small stroke in the margin. It may be noticed that he as well as modern editors places l. 135 after l. 42.

Publii Ovidii Nasonis Sulmonensis in *ibim* liber feliciter incipit.

2 inane. 10 in aduersas. 12 suo. 17 com- plector. 20 is. 22 om. est...ille. 23 dii (et semper). 25 grates meritas. 27 audiet. 30 quo...deditus.<sup>1</sup> 32 tempora. 36 quam.

<sup>1</sup> Conjectured by Birt.

40 rapta. 135 iaculis...iapyges. 137 pabula mollia. 139 bella geram tecum. 140 dabo. 47 fauentes. 50 petit. 52 brevis. 54 licambes. 55 bactiades. 62 ibis. 74 manes. 76 nectis. 84<sup>1</sup> chaos. 85 malefido digna ranuntur. 86 peragunt. 90 pasyphes. 98 fauere mee ueto. 109 clarus. 119 putere. 121 de facta. 124 optatamque fugit. 125 spiritus ortus Deserat. 127 eueniet. 128 et laeua. 130 semper perfide mortis. 131 saepe. 132 aufer et. 140 dabo. 142 exanimis. 143 tunc. 150 inique. 159 torta. 162 poenae. 167 carpent. 169 ilico. 182 ditia. 189 transcribes...monumenta uirorum. 190 manibus. 193 erit et. 197 in ida. 198 et...captat. 212 aclos. 229 imbuerant. 233 iunxerunt. 239 infans fumis. 241 inuimus. 242 cadant. 245 suae...horae. 247 et me. 248 dent modo dent. 249 accedant. 250 experiare. 253 paeantuis. 256 armatusque [inermis opem<sup>2</sup>]. 257 aliena. 259 trepidosque. 260 urbis. 265 praedicente. 272 et thamire. 275 melior tumidis. 277 sollertique. 280 secta trahuntur. 281 redimi. 282 cinyphis. 283 subsidio praesens sit numen. 284 nihil. 285 utue. 287 horestei...coepit. 292 corpore pascit aues. 293 hecratides...quintus. 295 aminciaden. 299 capiti achei. 301 chillide. 302 op. (om. primat) hostili. 303 pyrrhi. 304 abracias. 305 nataue ut aeacide. 306 nefas. 308 saucos. 309 casto. 310 quae cecidit. 311 inue. 312 quam. 313 utue...parentes. 317 A<sup>4</sup> ut oliuifera...sicone profectis. 318 morti. 319 leonis. 321 ingulare pherei. [323 aleuas<sup>3</sup>]. 325 utue milon. 327 quaeque in (om. cetera). 329 lemneus. 331 utue leuridamaster...thrasilli. 332 larisseeis. 335 passae [hippomeneide<sup>4</sup>]. 336 in actea destituaris. 337 sic tibi uexatos cum uita. 439 utue. 461 cassandrae dominus. 462 in-cesta. 345 dryantidae. 346 ingenio. 347 etheo. 348 calliroides. 351 iunxit uenerem. 352 neci. 357 canacis...facis. 359 thyeste. 362 tibi uel peretela. 366 brachia...fores.

<sup>1</sup> Chao. ed. Rubei. an. 1474.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. vet. apud Micylum.

<sup>3</sup> Conjectured by Scaliger.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. Aldina, an. 1502.

378 spinga. 380 facies...tectae tori. 384 toanteae. 396 turba. 403 uindice fusis. 404 temporibus nexus dexamenique pater. 405 satusne. 406 abisse. 407 scyron...poli-phemone. 409 ad auras. 411 gerens. 413 quae. 415 achemenides. 417 talis eris nec cum. 418 qua tua maphor erit. 419 ut. 429 solis ad. 434 tereidesque. 444 facti. 445 atque tuis. 446 sidonia sparsi. 447 pithoides. 449 exiguo est...libello. 450 coniecta...spargat. 455 nec uir nec foemina. 463 aeneius. 466 theodotus. 470 dixit hoesque. 471 maia est. 475 macedo...iacta est. 479 speculatus. 485 eipsenore. 487 uocante. 495 theneseae. 496 urbe. 497 omits et. 499 lindia. 502 thaleceae.

503 ligurigitem. 505 uultus. 510 regia turba. [511 aleuae]. 512 leotipidae...uiro. 515 astacidaeue<sup>5</sup>...cadauera. 523 athenas. 524 inuitus. 527 orestae. 533 siluis. 534 hebi sanguine cretus auro. 535 perue. 539 murrae. 540 urbis.<sup>6</sup> 541 achquo. 545 harpacides. 548 mimnermi.<sup>7</sup> 549 utque syracusio. 551 nuda que. 552 phrygii. 558 enosia. 559 ueluti. 560 malum. 562 machareus tu. 563 qualem iam capta cum flammae. 564 patrum...arce. 568 icarei. [569 acerno<sup>8</sup>]. 572 iactaque. 575 corebi. 576 argolicisque. 577 eathrae periturus. 581 ut cum damarictone. 585 utque...aborto. 586

batitus ipse. 587 sipmisso (sic) liquidum...disco. 590 ab idena. 595 coturnorum. 596 utq (om. cetera). 597 dilaceret. 600 orpheon-escape sutae. 601 althaeae...praesentibus. 603 compraensa. 605 pentheliden...lycinum. 609 milon...deducere. 611 inguen. 612 contulit. 619 falso. 621 ethalon...spoliaberis indus. 623 quemque. 625 pectora. 628 om. Phrygi...timido est. 629 rhoesus. 630 rhoesi tunc. 631 rhamneta. 632 hyrtacides hyrtacidaeque. 633 climadeue. 635 utue. 639 sunt. 641 roganti. 642 sed.

E. O. WINSTEDT.

<sup>5</sup> Conjectured by Sanctius: Merkel cites from C.

<sup>6</sup> Conjectured by Housman: Merkel cites from B.E.

<sup>7</sup> Suggested by Ellis as a possibility: Merkel cites from d.

<sup>8</sup> Conjectured by Politianus.

## SOME ITALIC ETYMOLOGIES AND INTERPRETATIONS.

(Concluded from p. 355.)

### IGNIS IN THE ITALIC DIALECTS.

Skr. *agnis* may represent primitive AGNIS, OGNIS or EGNIS; O. Bulg. *ogni* AGNIS or

OGNIS; Lat. *ignis* has been derived from EGNIS; Lith. *ugnīs* demands either a special phonetic explanation of the special pleading sort (v. Brugmann, Grundriss I<sup>2</sup> §148) or

must have had its initial vowel deflected by some popular etymology (cf. the author in *Modern Language Notes*, ii. 229, and Bartholomae, in the *Wochenschrift fuer klass. Philologie*, 15, 1052). The form AGNIS is on as good a footing as OGNIS, while EGNIS has the support of Latin *ignis* only. Let who will take comfort in the e/o gradation as a support for OGNIS, but when we deal with finished words, without reference to their semantic cognates, we must not put both EGNIS and OGNIS to the score of the primitive period.

In two places in the Italic dialects a word for fire other than *πῦρ* seems to be used. I cite from von Planta's text (*Grammatik der Oskisch-Umbrischen Dialekte*) No. 274, a part of a Marrucian inscription: *asignas ferenter auiatas toutai maroucai ioues patres oeres tarin cris iouias. agine iafc esnc agine asum babu poleenis feret 'proscinae feruntur auspicae Marrucae Iovis-patris ocris Tarineris Ioviae pompa. eas illa pompa assatum...fer.'* I understand *agine* as a locative and *babu* I interpret as an onomatopoeic word equal to Lat. *papa* 'food.' The consonantal relations of b/p are repeated in Lat. *bibit* 'drinks,' *potus* 'drunk.' Thus I interpret the inscription to contain directions for fetching *prosecta* to the (altar-) fire on a mount sacred to Jove, and then to burn them in the fire along with a pap of fine flour (*poleenis*: Lat. *pollen*).

The other passage is in the Agnone inscription (von Planta, No. 200): *aasai, purasai, saaktum, tefurum, altrei, pitereipid, akenei, sakahiter* 'in ara igniaria sanctum holocaustum in altero utroque—sancitur.'

The real difficulty in the above is the word *tefurum*, I take it. I note that in Umbrian *tefra* is practically a dual, being 3 times qualified by 'two' and 1 time by 'three.' We must therefore take *altrei pitereipid* here as a distributed dual. Thus I translate the passage: 'On an altar fit-for-fire the consecrated *tefura* are to be offered, one on one fire and one on another.' For the use of two altars I refer to the scene in Schreiber's *Atlas*, Plate XVII. 1. The entire inscription mentions in fact several altars (v. especially the obverse B), not all of which, probably, were for burnt offerings.

If the above interpretations are correct, and they seem to me more plausible than the current ones, then Italic along with Sanskrit and Old Bulgarian warrants AGNIS.

That AGNIS was the primitive form is no new contention for me (v. *American Journal* NO. CXVIII. VOL. XIII.

of *Philology*, 17, 24 seq.). We must after all, so far as it is possible, find the further kin of any word that we study, else no progress in semantics.

I can now strengthen my plea for the kinship of Lat. *ignis* with *agit*: Ennius, *Epicharmus* iii. *agilis* hic | est de sole sumptus *ignis*; Varro, *Bimarcus* iv.; et pater divum trisulcum *fulmen igni* fervido actum | mittat; Vergil, *Aen.* ix. 702: phalarica venit | *fulminis acta* modo; *ib.* x. 633; *agens hiemem*.

In the Rig-Veda *ajirā* 'active' and *ajirācoci* 'quick-flaming' are characteristic descriptions of Agni and, with full allowance for alliteration in Sanskrit, alliteration will not account for the Latin collocations cited.

I have already pointed out (l.c.) that in Greek αἰ-λῆ 'radiance' stands beside ἀγλαός 'radiant, shining' and thus αἰ- and ἀγ- form two possibly related bases; and further that αἰ- 'goat' stands beside Skr. *ajá* 'goat.' I am quite willing to believe that αἰ-λῆ has no connection with ἀγλαός, considering these words alone, or that αἰξ 'goat' has no connection with *ajá*; but taking them together the recurrence of the same phonetic abnormality can not well be set down to separate phonetic accidents. Therefore when I find that in the Rig-Veda there is a root *ej*-, *ij*-, *ing*- which is a pretty fair synonym of *aj*-, I conclude that the primitive roots AIG- and AG- had been confused by some semantic association to such a degree that derivatives of either will be found with meanings in accord. We may then keep the roots separate, if we choose, to suit some phonetic system, but logically it amounts to an identification of the two roots.

The special vowel color of *ignis* may of course be due to its coming from IGNIS, in the weakest grade to AIG, rather than to its having been put in fore-rhyme with *ictus* 'lightning,' as I have before suggested.

Conceivably cognate with AIG- is the root YAG-: 'sacrifice (with fire),' weak grade IG-. In Sanskrit, *Agni* and *yaj*- with its derivatives are in perpetual association. It is not impossible then that Lat. *ignis* belongs to YAG-, and this root I have already claimed for Lat. *Indigetes* (*Classical Review*, 12, 19).

A further Greek word is αὐγή 'sunlight, firelight,' cf. Skr. *ōjas* with the meaning 'shine' reported by native lexicographers but not yet verified in the literature. In the same vowel grade is Albanian *agume* 'dawn' with *ag*- from AUG-. If we reverse our diphthong after the *ay/yx* gradations

E E

now in vogue we find in Sanskrit *vakṣi* 'flame,' *vājra-* 'thunderbolt,' and *vāhni-*, a standing epithet of Agni, further possible cognates. Projecting all this upon an Aryan background we get the following bases on which words for 'fire' are built, viz. :—

(1) AG-,—Skr. *agnī*, O. Bulg. *ogni*, Osc. *ageni*, cf. Gk. *ἀγλαός* 'shining.'

(2) AIG-, alternating with YAG-, Gk. *αἶγ-λῆ* 'shine,' Lat. *aeger* 'ill' i.e. 'feverish' (cf. Gk. *πυρετός* 'heat, fever' for the sense), and *ignis* 'fire.' For YAG- I note also Gk. *ἀνίλ-αι* 'burns' (Sophocles).

(3) AUG-, alternating with WAG-, -Gk. *αἰγ-η* 'light,' Alban. *agume* 'dawn,' Lith. *ugnis* 'fire.' The Sanskrit forms from WAG- have been mentioned just above. Possibly Lat. *vagus* 'wandering' belongs here; for the meaning cf. *se agit*, *agitur* 'wanders, moves.'

I have passed in silence over the fact that AGNIS has a pure guttural and AG- appears in the *satem*-languages as a palatal-spirant. I have seen no reason to change the view already expressed in these pages (Vol. II. 298) that the triplicity of gutturals, however completely established for the close of the primitive period, must not be taken too seriously. That *k* *k* and *k<sup>w</sup>* are the product of a single K, the first when the environment was palatal, the second in the neighborhood of unrounded gutturals, the third in the neighbourhood of rounded gutturals,—this supposition, I say, is on the same basis as the fact that in Greek the triplicity of *τ κ γ* harks back to the unity of *k<sup>w</sup>*. It is no more a glottogonic speculation to assert the primitive unity of the three Aryan gutturals than it is to acknowledge the possibility of the analogical intermixture of the three series. It is true that in the interests of method the scholars of the last few decades have slighted anything but word for word comparisons, but the science of semantics will demand the arrangement of words in groups. I need not point out how in the verb there was a reason why AG- should take a palatal direction, and how no such reason existed for the noun AGNIS. This is not inconsistent with the usage of Skr. *ajirā-* Lat. *agilis* as epithets of AGNIS. Alliteration and figura etymologica are in essence the same thing. Figura etymologica may cease to be felt and alliteration remain, or consciousness of alliteration be lost and idiom remain. By way of specific defense of the *g/g* alternation here involved I may note that in a very recent collection of a mass of material (Bezzenger's *Beitrag* 24, 218, seq.) Hirt has reached the (glottogonic) conclusion that

palatals and pure gutturals are the product of more primitive pure gutturals.

#### LATIN ANNUS 'YEAR.'

The legitimate inference from the most probable etymologies of isolated words has seemed to me to be that -āgn- yielded in Latin -ān- or -ānn- (cf. *Classical Review* l. c.). Brugmann's examples in the last edition of the *Grundriss* (I, §762, 3) are not isolated words, and therefore prove nothing.

I now have another example of the phonetic change I contend for, viz., *annus* 'year,' which seems to appear in the dialectic forms Umbrian *acno-* and Osc. *aguno-* (?). (cf. von Planta *Grammatik*, Vol. II, p. 603). That in these dialectic forms -en- is the product of -tn- as von Planta suggests has nothing to recommend it on the Italic side and is but an attempt to save the relation with Gothic *apn* 'year,' and the vague reference of *annus* and *apn* to Skr. *atati* 'wanders.' For myself I must refuse in the main to accept a primitive form that rests on but two languages unless the only possible base of each of the two words recorded leads to the base reconstructed for the primitive period. The -nn- of Lat. *annus* does not infallibly go back to -TN-.

Believing with von Planta that the dialectic words cited most probably mean 'year,' and being convinced that -en- is a possible orthography for -gn- in the later as well as the earlier Umbrian tablets, I can see no reason why Lat. *annus*, Umbr. *acno-*, Osc. *aguno-* may not be referred to a common Italic base \**agno-* : AG- 'drives.'

To understand the development of meaning we must picture to ourselves a nomadic state of civilisation, where there was an annual migration, cf. Caesar's account of the Germans (B.G. iv. 1). Now in a cattle-raising community the driving up of the cattle may have given the name to the year, or first to a season of the year. In the Western part of the United States where cattle-raising is the prevailing occupation the annual round-up<sup>1</sup> of the cattle verifies the assumed state of things. Strangely enough our English forefathers used the term 'drift-of-the-forest' to designate an annual or semi-annual drive-up of the cattle. Still another motif back of the stem \**agno-* 'year' might be an annual chase of a hunting folk.

That the derivation of *annus* 'year' from the root AG- 'drives' is not pure fancy

<sup>1</sup> It is curious that *annulus*, 'ring,' is also explained by 'round-up.'



seems to be attested by the use of *āya* in Greek and *agit* in Latin with words meaning time. We may fairly conclude that the locution *annum agit* is an instance of *figura etymologica*.

We may base an argument against the originality of the *-m-* in *sollemnis* 'every-year' on the possibility that *-mn-* for *-m-* is due to labialisation from the lost *v* of *\*solvo-*.

#### OSCAN *amnūd* 'CAUSA.'

The possibility of explaining this word as a derivative from the preposition *ambi-* is not to be denied, but on the other hand it is impossible to prove that derivation. True we have *supinus* and *pronus*, but who shall tell us that *supinus* is not a compound like Skr. *ūrdhvā-sānu* 'with back up' and all the more as *sānu* 'back' appears in the weak form *-smu* in compounds in the Rig-veda. We can hardly question that *sānu-*, *-smu-* are extant in Lat. *sinus*. The Sanskrit word means 'ridge, back,' and according to Grassmann, 'surface of the soma-strainer'; *sinus* means 'bosom, bag of a fish-net, garment,' whence we may infer that their primitive meant 'curve, fold, bend.' So we might derive *supinus* from prim. Ital. *\*supu-smus* 'with back under.'

The chief difficulty with the word *amnūd* is the passage where it is rendered by 'circuitu' (von Planta, *l.c.* No. 127, 17).

The current interpretation of that passage is, I am convinced, incorrect. All that is left of the word before *amnūd* is the initial letter *rc-*, and this has been expanded by conjecture to *rehtud* 'recto' a word not elsewhere recorded in Umbrian. We may just as well restore *\*reginum* 'regionum.' This makes of the passage in question: *paī teremenniū mū (inīkad) tanginūd prūftūset r(e)ginum amnūd* the following sense: 'which bounds have been set up (or approved) by common agreement by way of augural-bounds.' This interpretation yields, I submit, a sense superior to the interpretation now in vogue.

What was the word from which *amnūd* 'causa' got its start? If we first construct *amnūd* as a derivative of *ambi-* and define that by *circuitus*, how shall we pass to *causa*? First by making *circuitu* a prepositional case meaning 'around,' and then assume a development on the lines of Greek *ἀμφί* or *περί*? Possible, but hardly probable, and certainly very roundabout.

I propose the following explanation, in the hope that it may seem to others as it

does to me to excel the current one in directness. I would define *amnūd* etymologically by our English prepositional phrase 'by way of,' German '*wegen*.' Its Latin cognate, in form merely, is *agmine* (abl.), but in Sanskrit the same word *ājman-* means 'way.' In Oscan *-mn-* is the product of *-gmn-*, though there is no reason why we may not suppose that *g* was lost in this combination in the Italic period.

#### OSCAN *regvinum*, UMBRIAN *ekvine*.

Supposing that the forms *regvinum raval-anum* are those that really occur on the obverse of a Nucérine coin (cf. von Planta, *l.c.* No. 215 a), and that *ekvine* is meant by the *ekvi ne* of the Iguvine tablets (IIa, 13), I propose the following interpretations for these almost hopelessly difficult words. I will assume that the *v* of both words is parasitic, due to an anticipation of the labial character of the stem *-no-*; or what amounts to the same thing, that *-vi-* is a way of representing a *-ū-* sound; or that it is the result of contamination of anaptyctic *-u-* and *-i(e)-* which would normally vary in the same paradigm to suit the vowel quality of the inflected syllables. If these suppositions may provisionally pass, then I venture to interpret the coin legend as 'Regionum Ravalanorum,' though to what locality the latter of the two words is gentile adjective I can form no conjecture.

As to Umbr. *ekvine* in the sentence *tra ekvine fetu* 'let him sacrifice across the *ekvino-*,' we may perhaps find a clue from the words *persnimu pert spinia* 'let him offer a prayer over the *spinia*' which occur later in the same tablet (36). We are accustomed to understand *spinia* as some sort of a table or altar, and I therefore look for the same sense in *ekvine*. Elsewhere the word *traf* occurs in Umbrian only with the object *sancta-*, and this again seems to mean some sort of 'dike' or 'enclosure about the place of sacrifice' unless it means 'altar.' The word *echinus* 'hedgehog' borrowed into Latin from Greek is the word I see in *ekvine*. The sense 'pot, jar, earthenware' is found in both Greek and Latin. The sense of 'altar,' which I would see in Umbrian, may be a special metaphor of that language: I note that in Homer a group of small islands is called 'Εξίαια, while the Italians, as Virgil tells us, called certain rocks rising up in the sea *Aræ*. The origin of the metaphor may have been very different, however. There is in Guhl and Kohners's *Das Leben der*



*Griechen und Römer* a cut of a little Greek altar (Fig. 43) with no little resemblance to the volutes and echinus of an Ionic column.

✓  
UMBRIAN AMPERIA (IIa 29.)

This word von Planta regards as not yet certainly interpreted. Not much certainly is to be said for Buecheler's *qua pes deficit*, which is a rather lame-footed explanation after all. The text gives us the sentence

✓  
*amperia persnihmu*. Very little certainly to hazard a guess upon. I propose to render into Latin by *ampullas precamino*. It seems that *-r-* in Umbrian sometimes stands for Lat.

✓  
*-l-*, and though the equation between *amperia* and *ampulla* is not absolutely free from objection the sense it furnishes is of the best. Prayers to the sacred vessels were even a characteristic feature of Italian worship (cf. the author in *Trans. of the Amer. Phil. Assoc.* 29 23), and in line 31 of our tablet we actually have *veskles-persnihmu* 'vasculis precamino.'

✓  
LATIN *infula* 'BAND.'

The etymology of Gk. *ἐνέριφος* can hardly yet be considered clear. Prellwitz (Woerterbuch, s.v.) gives up the problem, but later, s.v. *νόθος* 'bastard' gives the old comparison with Skr. *andhā* 'blind.' It seems to me, however, that we are on safer ground if we refer *andhā* 'blind, dark' to *adhās* 'under' and its antonym *ādhi* 'over,' a pair whose contrasting meaning shows their pronominal origin (cf. the author l.c. 29 27). The base, according to Prellwitz, was *ENEDHO-*, a base that involves some subtleties of gradation.

The word *-ενέριφος* in every occurrence in Homer, Hesiod and the Homeric hymns may be rendered by 'covered.' It is affirmed of hair on the head and shoulders, nap upon a shaggy cloak, ointment upon the head or body, dust on the shoulders. This is the whole story.

As to its formation I would explain *-ενέ-*

*ροθε* by *ἐνέριφος*. Its 'root' I take to be *-roth-* and its primary meaning 'binds.' The Sanskrit cognate is *apinādyāti* 'binds together, covers' (cf. *Rig-Veda* x. 68, 8).

The word *νόθος* is cognate. I note Skr. *nāhu-s* 'friend, neighbour.' It is very curious that the same relation of meaning recurs in O. Fr. *bastir* 'sew, baste' and *filz de bast* 'bastard,' *bast* meaning 'illicit union, liaison.' In *liaison* the same metaphor remains. Is metaphor the permanent thing in language? At any rate the relation between Skr. *sūnās* 'son' and its numerous cognates with *sūnā* 'woven basket,' *sūtra* 'yarn' appears to show the same metaphor (cf. Lat *suit* 'sews'); the puzzle of *filius* 'son' may perhaps be lightened by setting it alongside of *filum* 'thread' (: *figit* 'fastens.'). If *filia* could be proved to be older than *filius* then some one might draw us a picture of a primitive Italic 'spinster' to put as a companion piece to the famous Aryan 'milkmaid.' In the terms of our metaphor *servus* 'bondman,' degraded in sense like *νόθος*, belongs with *serit* 'binds.'

Latin has also an interesting cognate to the root *NEDH-* 'binds,' viz. *infula* ('head-band,' from *EN-NADH-LO-*, with the Italic initial syncope. At some period before historical Latin began *\*enflo* was the form of the stem. If we divide this *\*enflo* there is a choice between explanations for the *f* of *infula*; the *f* was either felt as initial in a compound or *-nfl-* when heterosyllabic (cf. the author l.c. p. 25) was not further reduced. This last explanation is applicable, mutatis mutandis, to the word *infra* 'beneath.' With the proper explanation of *combretum* 'rush' as *con-sertum* (cf. the author, l.c. p. 18) the only thing to negative the claim that *-NDH-* yielded *n-fr* in Latin disappears.

EDWIN W. FAY.

(Lexington, Va.,)  
March 14, 1899.

P.S.—Von Planta in the Addenda to his *Grammatik* has anticipated this explanation of *infula*.

Austin, University of Texas,  
August, 1899.

## ON THE NEW FRAGMENTS OF JUVENAL.

LINE 19 of the longer of the new fragments of Juvenal is presented by the codex as follows :

his languentem animum seruant et seria uitae.

Herr Max Maas who has published in the last number of Wölflin's *Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik* (1899), pp. 419 sqq. a text of the new fragment, wherein the emendations published in the *Classical Review* of May and June are laid under contribution with good results,<sup>1</sup> together with a translation into German, renders the Latin as follows : 'Für die bewahren sie das wenige was ihnen von Seele und Lebensernst geblieben ist.' But it will be seen that the words which I have put into italics can hardly be said to represent the Latin as it stands. Mr. Herbert Richards wrote to me in the course of last summer suggesting that 'et seria' conceals 'ad seria,' and this, I think, is right. But further change is required as 'languentem,' which has every appearance of being genuine, is still unsatisfactory. It will cease to be so if we shift it two words further on in the line, thus :

his animum seruant languentem ad seria uitae.

'For these creatures they keep the soul which is sickened for life's serious work.' The use of *ad* needs no illustration : still compare Virgil *Aen.* 6. 5 'cessas ad uota precesque, | Tros, ait, Aenea.' I take the opportunity of assuring Prof. P. Thomas (see *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique* No. 7, 1899, p. 5 of the *extrait*) that the colon I placed at the end of v. 19 was intended to serve the

same purpose as his comma, that is, to show that the phrase 'quicquid praeterea scit qui docet' was to be construed after 'discunt' in the preceding line.

J. P. POSTGATE.

Magonum pueros uera ac miserabilis urit debilitas. follisque pudet cicerisque relictis.

Hitherto, so far as I know, nothing has been printed about the exact meaning of the words 'follisque pudet cicerisque relictis' : but I am told that the meaning which I attach to them is not that which in general finds favour. So I venture to record my interpretation.

At first sight, taking *follis* to stand for the scrotum, and *cicer* for the testicles, and supposing *relictis* to mean 'left behind' (comp. *relictis rebus*, passim), I translated : 'they are ashamed of their empty bag and the peas which they have lost.' To this, my friends, Professor Postgate and Professor Platt object, the former that *relictis* should mean, not 'left behind,' but 'left in their possession,' the latter that *cicer* should mean, not 'peas,' but 'pod.' I am not prepared to say with Professor Postgate that *relictis* cannot mean 'left behind' ; but, on the ground that the unfortunates would more properly be described as 'ashamed of what they still have,' I gratefully accept Professor Postgate's rendering, 'all that is left to them.' Professor Platt's remark, which he backs by a reference to Aristophanes' use of *ἐπέβυθος* in the sense of *πέος* (see. L. and S.), seems to me indubitably right. Our joint interpretation is then : 'they are ashamed of the bag (the scrotum) and the pod (the penis) which alone remain to them.'

H. J.

25th October, 1899.

## NOTES AND QUERIES.

ÆSCH. *Agam.* 670, 1.

ὥς μήτ' ἐν ὄρμῃ\* κύματος ζάλην ἔχειν  
μήτ' ἐξοκείλαι πρὸς κραταίλων χθόνα.

\*ὄρμῃ Wecklein. Dr. Verrall does not seem quite satisfied with this emendation ; but accepts it pro-

visionally. May I suggest ἐν ὀλκῷ, which gives excellent sense without departing very much from the MSS. reading. οὐματος ὀλκοι (for waves) is found in *Apl. Rhod.* I. 1167.

G. F. ABBOTT.

SOPH. *Phil.* 66.—The MSS. read *τούτων γὰρ οὐδέμ' ἀλγυνεῖς*.

Dindorff corrects *τούτων γὰρ οὐδέν ἀλγυνεῖ μ'*.  
Jebb adopts Buttmann's emendation:

*τούτω γὰρ οὐδέν μ' ἀλγυνεῖς*.

In my opinion, there is no necessity to retain both the *ν* and *μ* of the MSS.: the one evidently is a corruption of the other. Nor need we insist on making Odysseus refer to his own feelings, especially as the permission he gives above to Neoptolemus concerns all the Grecian chiefs: καὶ ἡμῶν (l. 65).

I venture to propose the mere substitution of *ν* for *μ* in the reading of the first hand of the *Laurentianus*, and read:

*τούτω γὰρ οὐδέν' ἀλγυνεῖς* 'thou wilt cause pain to no one by that.'

G. F. ABBOTT.

ON SOPHOCLES, *Ajax* 869.—It is ill gleaning after Professor Jebb's harvesting. Nevertheless I venture to suggest that the above passage may not be as corrupt as is so often thought, and to advance a conjecture in support of my view.

Few, I think, will seriously doubt that in the line *κοῦδεις ἐπιστάται με συμμαθεῖν τόπος* the first and last words, and perhaps too *συμμαθεῖν*, are practically correct. The sense plainly is something like 'no place enables one to learn his whereabouts,' 'no spot makes one cognisant.' The idea of dwelling-places or the like having a story to tell is not unknown, e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 37, 1090. But even if we allow the legitimacy of Elmsley's construction 'μὲ συμμαθεῖν idem est quod ὥστε συμμαθεῖν,' we cannot make much out of the traditional text. Suppose it really can mean 'no place knows him so that I could share its knowledge'—what then? Some place *must* know him, for he must be or have been somewhere. And the Greek is so pitiful! Clearly the text is corrupted, —but not much.

I think then that the very slightest of changes will set the line on its feet again. Read for *ἐπιστάται* the almost exactly similar *ἐπικτᾶται*, and we get the statement 'no place takes me to share its knowledge.' Some place certainly has a knowledge of Aias' whereabouts; but it will not communicate it. We have a like use of the verb in *Antig.* 846 *ἐνυμῶντορας ἔμμ' ἐπικτῶμαι*, where Professor Jebb translates 'ye at least will bear me witness'; Antigone is addressing nature when man has deserted her, and the verb means 'to take a person for the purpose of communicating something to him.' Places may have stories to tell, as I have already remarked; and their silence may be described as a refusal to divulge them by a poet who, like Sophocles, objects to drinking out of the cistern.

L. D. BARNETT.

#### EMENDATION OF MANILIUS, V. 372.

Of the bird-fancying tastes which birth under the constellation *Cygnus* produces Manilius writes v. 370:—

*mille fluent artes: aut bellum indicere mundo  
et medios inter volucres prensare meatus  
aut nido captare suo ramone sedentem.*

The reading of the last line is Bentley's palaeographically improbable correction for the MS. reading *aut nitidos clamare suis* (with two variants, *nitidis* written over *nitidos* and *damnare* written over *clamare*, in the *Gemblacensis*). Bentley got his *suis* from a 'codex Venetus,' and if that is right, it is not difficult to find something better than *captare*. Read

*aut nido excantare suo ramone sedentem.*

The corruption began by the change of *x* to *s*—a change particularly easy in compounds of *ex* where the vowel was early dropped in Vulgar Latin—and a wrong attachment of the sibilant. An exact parallel is Prop. 3, 11, 58 'femineo extimuit' corrupted to 'femineas timuit.' For *excantare* cf. e.g. Prop. 3, 3, 49, 'ut per te clausas sciat excantare puellas,' and for the meaning Aelian. H.A. 8, 24, τῶ γὰρ τοι μέλει τῶν ἄλλων ὀρέων αἰρεῖ τὰ ἀπᾶν προσπετόμενα τῇ τῆς εἰμονίας θέλει, and Mart. 14, 218, 'non tantum calamis sed cantu fallitur ales, | callida dum tacita crescit harundo mora.' The change of *cantare* to *clamare* was perhaps more or less conscious, as *clamare* has the sense of *uocare* in late Latin.

J. P. POSTGATE.

#### QUERY ON CICERO, *Cato Maior*, § 28.

CAN any explanation or emendation be offered in connection with the word 'splendescit' in the following passage of Cicero's *Cato Maior* (c. 9, 28):— 'Orator metuo ne languescat senectute; est enim munus eius non ingenii solum, sed laterum etiam et virium. Omnino canorum illud in voce SPLENDESCIT etiam nescio quo pacto in senectute.'

Can an orator, as such, be said to fail (*languescere*), if the full clear ring of tone, characteristic of the true orator, acquires increased brilliancy (*splendescit*) in spite of old age? Dr. Hennings has suggested (*Fleckeisen's Jahrb.* 1893) the reading 's<u>plentescit' = *sublentescit*. Sommerbrodt considers 'sublentescit' as not sufficiently comprehensive, hints at a possible reading 'subtenuescit,' but retains 'splendescit.' As the passage now stands, a further difficulty presents itself in the subsequent sentence 'sed tamen . . . oratio,' which takes up the thread of the discourse immediately after 'ne languescat senectute.' If 'splendescit' be retained, the sentence introduced by 'sed tamen' ('but, as I was going to say') loses all point. The 'sublentescit' of Hennings makes the passage coherent—not satisfactory. The proposed emendation 'subtenuescit' is scarcely tenable, either paleographically or otherwise. That full clear ring of tone, so peculiar to the genuine orator, does not become thin (*tenue*) with increasing years, though it slackens and becomes more lingering (*lentu*). Were it not for the laws of paleography, one might venture a third conjecture, 'submitescit,' which in its sense of gradually becoming more subdued and more mellow expresses the change wrought by old age in 'canorum illud in voce' and resulting in 'sermo remissus' and 'mitis oratio,' which is so suited to an orator advanced in years.

PAUL O. BARENDT.

## REVIEWS.

ROBERTS' *LONGINUS*.

*Longinus on the Sublime*, the Greek Text edited after the Paris Manuscript with Introduction, Translation, Facsimiles and Appendices by W. RHYS ROBERTS, M.A. Cambridge University Press, 1899. Pp. x., 288. 9s.

THE lack of a good English edition and commentary has done much to banish Longinus *On the Sublime* from the repertory of English scholars. The attractive and scholarly volume now issued by Prof. Rhys Roberts should restore to the treatise much of that consideration which it enjoyed in the Augustan Age of English Literature, when it had been reinterpreted to men of letters by the version of Boileau. Reaching its own ideal of criticism as 'a last and crowning fruit of long experience' (c. vi.), it deserves a place 'among the Immortals.' Within its own province, which secures it from any direct competition with the *Poetics* of Aristotle, it is the masterpiece of ancient literary criticism, delicate and profound, perennial in interest and fertile in suggestion. And even its technical terms remind us, how little new and independent contribution English has made to the study and analysis of style. Metaphor, climax, period, paraphrase, hyperbole, apostrophe, periphrasis—are they not all naturalised heirlooms, handed down from the schools of Alexandria and Athens? and Prof. Roberts has wisely bowed to the inevitable in admitting *asyndeton*, *anaphora*, *diatyposis* and such like to his translation, paraphrasing their meaning in footnotes.

In lovers of Greek literature it cannot fail to quicken understanding of the specific charms of Homer or Herodotus, Plato or Demosthenes, or to add a sense that literary appreciation is something worth cultivating and worth having, a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰὲν* for the enrichment of life. But it appeals to all ages and all schools of criticism. Though the applications are individual, and often delicately subtle and minute, the principles are universal, and the *Περὶ Ὑψους* gives as good a basis for a critical appreciation of Pope or Tennyson or Rudyard Kipling, as of the Homer or Sappho or Lysias, from whom it draws its actual illustrations. It strengthens faith in the existence and in the study of 'classical' literature, and gives assurance of that survival of the fittest, which guarantees the ultimate prevalence of

genius against the temporary aberrations of envy or stupidity (c. vii. 3-4, xxxvi. 2). Still more remarkable is the note of *moral* conviction and sincerity that underlies the whole treatment of literary criticism. The secret of style—no less than in Ruskin's teaching the secret of art—lies hid in the depths of character. 'Eloquence is the ring of a great soul'—Prof. Roberts enfeebles the phrase by rendering ἀπῆχμα as 'echo' (ix. 2)—is among the aphorisms which give the treatise so much nobility of note. All power of high expression, τὸ ὕψος which he strives to analyse, is the outcome and counterpart of high ideas, proceeding from that 'which lifts men towards the majesty of God'—τὸ ὕψος ἐγγὺς αἰρεῖ μεγαλοφροσύνης θεοῦ (xxxvi. 1). The vocation of the author is ennobling: poet and orator compete with wise men made perfect; they 'write for antiquity,' and stand before the judgment-bar of all posterity (xiii., xiv., xxxv.). If eloquence decays, it cannot be from want of opportunity or even loss of political liberties, but from the deeper and more clinging servitudes of love of pleasure and love of wealth (xliv.).

The general aim and methods of the treatise are well handled in the Second Section of the Introduction (p. 23-37), while the First Section (p. 1-23) deals with the question of authorship. The decision in favour of first century, and probably Alexandrian, authorship might be adopted with even less reserve than Prof. Roberts thinks it right to maintain. The list of authors cited, given at p. 216 in tabular form, goes far in itself to decide the matter; it contains names representing every century from Homer to the first century B.C., and *not one* of later date. The prominence given to Caecilius in the scope and composition of the work, and the passing allusion to Theodorus, are barely reconcilable with third century authorship; while the mainstay of the traditional ascription to Longinus, the reference to Ammonius in xiii. 3, went over to the enemy with fatal effect, when the Venetian scholia revealed the earlier Ammonius, follower of Aristarchus, who wrote τὰ ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος μετενηνεγμένα ἐξ Ὁμήρου. The arguments are well marshalled in the Introduction, though the inferences from Vocabulary and Comparative Syntax might be more fully and firmly established.



matter of arrangement the interests of the philologist have from this point been sacrificed to those of the general reader or the literary critic. With a writer so fanciful and often so 'precious' in diction, so free with *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* (not very far short of one per page), so loose in symmetry and structure of clause, so mannered in the ordering of words, handling terms and topics outside the beat of 'School' authors, it is no doubt a comfort to have an English version upon the facing page. Such an arrangement is justified by the scheme and intention of the book; but accepting this, and as a consequence the relegation of Notes to the end of the Text, the elaboration of Appendices is needlessly harassing to the Greek student. Variants and sources of quotation are at the foot of the Text. Appendix A headed 'Textual' throughout, first deals with Manuscripts; then passes into 'Critical Notes,' which contain much that is not 'critical' at all. The whole of p. 174 for instance is concerned with interpretation of rare architectural terms; and the artificial severance between the treatment of text and exegesis breaks completely down. Next comes Appendix B, with page-headings 'Linguistic,' which deals first with points of grammar and comparative vocabulary, and then passes into a Glossary, chiefly of Rhetorical terms disposed alphabetically, but including particles like *αὐτίκα*, *αὐτόθεν*, *γούν*, *μήποτε*, *πάντη* or words such as *ἴαναι*, *πίπτειν* and *προσπίπτειν*, and *φαντασία*, whose interest is solely exegetical or in some speciality of use. These critical and linguistic Appendices should take the form of Notes, and classification by Chapter and Section would be more convenient than by page and line. Appendix C, called Literary, opens with a good Tabular Analysis of the whole work, which for ease of reference should precede the text; then deals with authors and citations alphabetically, including an elaborate Excursus upon Moses, and giving a last place to the unnamed Longinus. While Appendix D supplements an excellent Bibliography with some pages upon the influence of the work on the French, German, and English Schools of Literary Criticism, which it would have been easy and more judicious to incorporate in the Introduction.

To come to details. Appendix C, on authors cited, is excellent, and on the whole well-proportioned. In referring to authorities, there is some tendency to ignore the obvious, and quote the recondite. Under Gorgias, for instance, it would have been more to the purpose to refer to the appendix

in Thompson's *Gorgias*; and knowledge of Hecataeus may be gained without access to Giacomo Tropea's monograph.

The Translation has been executed with care and skill, and is more faithful to the original than other English versions. Longinus is a difficult author to understand, and still more to translate. The main defect of this translation is want of nerve, and also of lightness of touch. In dealing with a writer, who revels in polysyllabic comparatives and superlatives (*ἄξιοθαυμαστότερον*, *σωματοειδέστερον*, *μεγαλορρήμονόστερα*, κ.τ.λ.), who must give big verbs big inflections (e.g. *τελειουργέισθαι*, *καταρχαιρεσιάζεσθαι*, *κεκαλλιγραφημένοι*), and who habitually overloads both words and sentences, it is deadly to expand *ὅπως* into 'in whatever form it presents itself' (xv. 1), or *πῶς* into 'in a mysterious way' (xiv. 1). The sentence in which the latter occurs may be taken as characteristic: *προσπίπτοντα γὰρ ἡμῖν κατὰ ζῆλον ἐκείνα τὰ πρόσωπα καὶ οἷον διαπρέποντα τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνοίσει πῶς πρὸς τὰ ἀνειδωλοποιούμενα μέτρα* becomes 'for those personages, presenting themselves to us and inflaming our ardour and as it were illumining our path, will carry our minds in a mysterious way to the high standards of sublimity which are within us.' *προσπίπτοντα*, *πρόσωπα*, *οἷον*, *διαπρέποντα*, *πῶς*, *ἀνειδωλοποιούμενα* are all in succession overdone, and it would be simpler and truer to write 'their great examples kindle our emulation, and are like beacon-lights to raise our souls to ideal standards of excellence.' Or to take a single phrase, 'vividness of form' comes closer to *ταῖς τῶν σχημάτων εἰδοποιήσις* than 'the visualising qualities of these figures' (xviii. 1). Here and there, e.g. in his 'stomach' for *ἀναγκοφαγήσαι* (xxxi. 1), 'maim' for *ἀκρωτηριάζει* (xxxix. 3), and 'scale the heights' for *ἐφίεσθαι τῶν ἄκρων* (xxxiii. 2), Prof. Roberts has given excellent samples of the thing required, while his 'wizened' is a really brilliant attempt at rendering the rhetorical *κατασκελετενόμενα* of ii. 1. Elsewhere he misses obvious chances; 'a richly caparisoned style' is heavy for the 'jingling his bells' (*κῶδωνας ἐξήφθαι*) of the original (xxiii. 4), and *ἀγῶνος ἐμπλεων* (xxvi. 3) is 'in the thick of the fray' rather than 'full of active participation.'

Slips are somewhat numerous, but do not detract from a high standard of general excellence. In i. 4 *ἀθρόαν* is 'at a stroke' rather than 'in all its plenitude.' In the face of fixed technical usage, it is impossible to give *βάθος* (ii. 1) the sense 'lofty' or

'profo-  
site, n  
I beli  
other  
'emot  
'passi  
'mom  
iii. 2 s  
'show  
metap  
Heller  
e.g. D  
ninus,  
deserv  
specifi  
of' is  
again  
τῆς ἀκ  
'appes  
'does  
πεπονη  
and σ  
specifi  
words.  
ἀπ. λε  
'accun  
ἐποικο  
than o  
the fo  
render  
the rel  
ἀποχε  
derives  
'tribut  
introd  
§ 4 t  
especi  
indefe  
'It is  
reprod  
produc  
possibi  
has its  
'there  
'imagi  
and th  
only c  
use of  
misrea  
(comp  
curious  
pointin  
imagin  
and th  
and fa  
imposs  
in xvi  
techni  
'place



'profound'; it is unmistakably the opposite, not the equivalent, of *ὕψος*. In ii. and I believe in almost (if not quite) every other passage of the work, *πάθος* and *παθητικόν* should be rendered 'emotion' and 'emotional,' rather than by 'passion' and 'passionate'; *φορά* is 'impulse,' rather than 'momentum' or 'transport' (xx. 2). In iii. 2 and x. 7 *φλοιώδης* means 'superficial,' 'showy,' rather than 'frivolous'; this metaphorical use of *φλοιός* is common in Hellenistic rhetoricians and philosophers, e.g. Diogenes Laertius, Lucian, M. Antoninus, and Plutarch, and *φλοιώδης* hardly deserves to be singled out (p. 211) as specifically Plutarchean. In iv. 3 'speaks of' is very inadequate for *ἐπιφωνεῖ* 'declaims against' or 'denounces.' In vii. 3 *μόνης τῆς ἀκοῆς* is used of the grandiloquence that 'appeals only to the ear,' not that which 'does not survive a first hearing.' In viii. 1 *ποιημένη* has its technical sense 'poetical,' and *σύνθεσις* (as c. xxxix. shows) is used specifically of the order or arrangement of words. *Ἐποικονομία* in xi. 2 is among the *ἀπ. λεγ.*, but has probably the sense of 'accumulation'—like the rhetorical term *ἐποικοδομεῖν*, which occurs xxxix. 3—rather than of 'orderly arrangement' which misses the force of the preposition. In xiii. the rendering of *στόμα* by 'caves' quite misses the reference to the 'mouths' of seers; the *ἀπογευστάμενος* is of 'irrigation runnels' derived from Homer, and the translation 'tributary streams' (repeated from Havell) introduces an unfortunate confusion. In § 4 the substitution of *εἰδῶν* for *ἡθῶν*, especially in so conservative a text, seems indefensible, and I should prefer to render 'It is no question of stealing, but rather a reproduction of beautiful traits, or forms or products of art.' In xiv. 3 *αὐτόθεν* cannot possibly mean 'from the very thought,' but has its usual sense (cf. xxxi. 1, xxxvi. 1) of 'thereupon.' In xv. *φαντασία* merely means 'imagination'; the translation 'images' and the comparison with Stoic usage (p. 210) only confuse a quite common Hellenistic use of the word. In xv. 8 *προσεκρίπτων* is a misreading or misprint for *προεκρίπτων* (compare xxxviii. 1), and the sense is curiously confused; the author is only pointing out that the limits and province of imagination differ in poetry and in oratory, and that in oratory deviations into poetry and fable and the world of the romantic and impossible are fatally out of place. *τόπος* in xvi. 1, and again xvii. 1, has its common technical meaning 'topic,' and the rendering 'place' gives bad Greek in both places:

later in the same chapter the technical implication of *ὅρκων πίστις*, associated with *ἀπόδειξις*, *παράδειγμα*, *ἐγκώμιον* and *προτροπή*,—a clear reminiscence of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*—is missed; and there is the same want of perception in translating *ὁ τύπτων*, *ὁ παθών*, and *ὕβριζων* by 'the smiter,' 'the sufferer' and 'insolence' (c. xx.).

In later chapters, the interpretation of *πρόχρησις* (xxvii. 2), a *ἀπαξ εἰρημένον*, as 'preferential use,' seems quite impossible, and *πρόσχησις* should be adopted: *τὰ ἐρμηνευτικά* means 'expression,' just as the substantive in v. 1 and xliii. 3: *ὀλοσχερῶς* (xliii. 4) cannot mean 'in massive images,' but has its usual Hellenistic sense 'in general terms,' and the 'hills and eminences' of baggage quite out-Herod the 'mounds and ridges' of the original. In xxxvi. 3 *τὸ ὑπεραίρον* is transitive, just as *αἶρει* in xxxvi. 1; *κατάρνηθμα* and *κατεργημισμένα* mean 'reduced to rhythm' not 'over-rhythmical'; *τόνος* (xxxiv. 5) means 'intensity' not 'the tone'; and *ῥθος* has nothing to do with 'character-sketches' in xxix.

Among more debatable points, the author's partiality for such *συν-* compounds as *συνακμάζειν*, *συνχρησθαι*, *συνεξομοιοῦσθαι*, *συνηχεῖν* and many more, convinces me that *συνκινεῖν* and *συνκίνησις* imply 'sympathetic emotion,' and not 'commotus animi.' *περιγραφή* xi. 3—like the common *περιγράφειν* of Stoic writers—means 'circumscription,' in the sense of 'isolation' or *ἐκλογή* of main ideas; and I am tempted, though usage and tradition are here both upon the side of Dr. Roberts, to suggest a *middle* sense for *παρολιγορούμενον* in xxxiii. 2, as 'an element of disdainfulness,' that is somewhat contemptuous in its disregard of rules and conventions; this seems more appropriate and relevant than to interpret it passively as = *παρορώμενον*. Two difficult passages invite fuller consideration. The first is the well known crux at the end of c. x. *λυμαίνεται γὰρ ταῦτα τὸ ὅλον ὥσπερ ψύγματα ἢ ἀραιώματα ἐμποιοῦντα <ἐς> μεγέθη συνοικονομούμενα τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα σχέσει συντεταχισμένα*, where Prof. Roberts introduces *ἐς* without MS. authority, makes *ψύγματα* accusative to *ἐμποιοῦντα*, and (misunderstanding I think a use of *magnitudines* in Vitruvius) interprets *μεγέθη* as 'big edifices,' and translates: 'For these faults mar the effect of the whole, just as though they introduced chinks or fissures into stately and coordered edifices; whose walls are compacted by their mutual adjustment.' *Μέγεθος* is one of the commonest words in the *Περὶ Ὑψους*, and has *always* the sense 'size, greatness,' and

to that we must adhere here; ἐς has no manuscript support, and the construction with ἐμποιεῖν is intolerable; so indeed is the 'Homeric' architectural sense attributed to ἐμποιεῖν. I understand ἐμποιεῖν in the familiar sense 'to give an idea,' 'produce an impression,' and take the ὅσωνε clause, as position suggests, as nominative in apposition to ταῦτα. ψύγματα and ἀραιώματα are clearly architectural terms, indicating superficial or trivial adjuncts, which detract from the sense of structural mass and solidity. 'Chinks and fissures' are misleading. By ψύγματα I understand decorative 'voids' or loopholes, and by ἀραιώματα taper or tracery work of any kind, such as the crockets and finials of medieval architecture. The συντεταχισμένα—and there is no kind of authority for the ingenious but unlikely correction συνεστοιχισμένα—gives the clue to the precise figure present to the writer's mind, that namely of a *rampart* weakened by perforated courses or by ragged embrasure, pinnacle, or parapet work. Finally to συνοικοιούμενα—and in this architectural context it is quite unlikely that an original συνοικοδοούμενα would have been corrupted—I give the sense 'contracted,' or 'reduced,' which is approached by οικονομία in its transition to 'economy.' I would thus offer as a rendering of the two final clauses—in which 'winnowed' is fatal to the imagery employed—the following: 'Carefully selecting their main points and giving them just value, they combined them in a stately whole, allowing nothing flimsy, mean, or trivial to intrude: for such adjuncts only mar the general effect, like loopholes or tracery, giving the impression of reduced mass, if juxtaposed as fretwork in a rampart face.'

Without discussing details in the corrupt ending of c. xlii., I suggest as a plausible reconstruction—συγκοπή μὲν γὰρ κολούει τὸν νοῦν, συντομία δ' ἐπευθύνει τὰ ἀκαιρον μῆκος ἀναινούμενα· δῆλον δ' ὡς ἔμπαιν τὰ ἐκτάδην ἀπόψυχα—'Curtness cripples the sense, while compression gives point to thoughts that will not bear undue expansion. Prolixity, conversely, is fatal to life.'

To the positive reconstruction of the Greek text Prof. Roberts has contributed nothing, except by resolute adherence to the readings of *P*, which (perhaps consciously) he carries to excess. The retention of ἐπέστραπται in xii. 3, in the face of Bentley's 'inevitable' ἀπαστράπτει, shows serious defect of instinct. True ἐπεστραμμένος (like καταστραμμένος and συνεστραμμένος) is used of λόγος or of style, and—in a quite different

sense—Demosthenes is said ἐπιστρέφειν τὸν λόγον πρὸς τινα, but that no more justifies Δημοσθένους ἐπεστράπτει than the use of *pressus* of Tacitean style would justify *Tacitus premitur* for 'Tacitus is condensed'! ἐπέστραπται is not Greek, while ἀπαστράπτει perfectly fits the passage, and repeats itself in the καταβροντᾷ καὶ καταφέγγει, and the βάπτον ἂν τις κερανοῖς φερομένοις ἀντανοῖται τὰ ὄμματα δύναιτο 'one could sooner face thunderbolts unwinking,' of c. xxxiv. In xxxii. 8, as ὅμως αὐτὸ is quite untranslatable, Tucker's brilliant ὁ Μῶμος αὐτοῦ, with its easy dittography, certainly deserves acceptance, unless something better should be offered; the αὐτοῦ, to which the note takes exception, seems to me not only admissible, but necessary; as for post-classical usage, the word occurs in Plutarch, and the personification in Babrius. Similarly ὑστεροφημίας may safely be replaced for ἕτερα φήμης in xliv. 8. Another proposal of Tucker's, εἰδωλίκως for ἡδὺ λιτῶς in xxxiv. 2, is properly rejected, for the word is quite inappropriate of Hyperides; but editors have not seen that the clause needs punctuation, and that a comma is wanted after ἡδὺ. Then λιτῶς, which is used of simple fare and has nothing to do with 'piquancy,' reinforces the μετὰ ἀφελείας of preceding clause, and qualifies ἐφηδυνόμενον. 'His gift of characterisation is sweet and well-flavoured, though always simple in its flavouring.' In the last clause of c. xxxiii., ἡ οὐδείς seems quite impossible; surely ἀλλὰ (for MS. ἦ) has been lost in the termination of preceding ἀνυέστατα. In l. 7 of the treatise, Spengel's εἶγε—introducing a genitive absolute!—seems no better than MS. εἶρ', or Manutius' εἶρ', and certainly use in i. 4 is not a parallel; ἄρε at once sets all right, and the facsimile shows how easily the error may have occurred.

The Glossary, forming part of Appendix B, contains useful notes, especially on Rhetorical terms, but for Hellenistic Lexicography, particularly of a technical kind, criticism of Liddell & Scott is surely gratuitous. There is but one reference to Stephanus' *Thesaurus*, and that not very happy, for ἐμφορέματα in xii. 2 means 'that bear upon,' 'that are concerned in,' rather than 'constituent parts.' But for illustration of διαίρειν, διάγραμμα, διάρσις, or again of σχολικός, εἰπνεία, μεταβολή, or almost any of the words here glossed, the stores of the *Thesaurus* would have proved invaluable. As matters of interpretation, δεινότης 'oratorical power' is quite distinct from δεινότης 'rhetorical intensification'; the sense of

'crav'  
is im  
the p  
Peric  
(some  
the w  
γνωμ  
tentio  
or wh  
the s  
M. A  
course  
ἀήρ, s  
Ant. i  
than t  
τῶν πα  
φωνα

La Po  
HAT  
1891

MESSR  
with a  
notes b  
sixty p  
involve  
notes a  
and ele  
to quit  
discuss  
given a  
drama.  
places  
editors  
(l. 3)  
notes o  
are far  
some r  
editors

C. Juli  
Bell.  
tions  
Sekon  
Text  
B. G.

THE au  
the 29th

'craving popularity' attributed to δοξοκοπεῖν is impossible in xxiii. 2, and unsuitable to the passage quoted from Plutarch's *Life of Pericles*; neither is κόπτειν τὴν δόξαν 'to hit (some one else's) fancy' possible Greek: the word is framed on the same model as γνωμοτυπεῖν, and means exactly to be 'sententious,' 'opinionated,' of one who 'coins' or who 'raps out opinions' too dogmatically; the sense 'conceit' is quite admissible in M. Anton. xi. 18. τοῦ περιέχοντος is of course neuter, not masculine understanding ἀγῶν, and for usage such passages as M. Ant. iv. 39, viii. 54 give better comparisons than the *Eurip. Fr.* cited; in the same way τῶν παραφάνων xxviii. 1 represents τὰ παράφωνα rather than παράφωνοι φθόγγοι as given

in Index. It would have been better to omit particles from the Special Glossary, and the notes on ἀμέλει, ἀντίκα and γοῶν are quite at fault.

Though not free from flaws, the book is a valuable addition to English Classical literature, and deserves a place on the shelves of all scholars and humanists. They will find in it delight and stimulus. The volume is a fragment of a larger literary scheme, which has our heartiest sympathy, and for the execution of which Prof. Rhys Roberts shows himself highly qualified. It is most satisfactory to see English scholars turning their energies to the too neglected fields of Hellenistic literature.

GERALD H. RENDALL.

#### HATZFELD AND DUFOUR'S *POETICS*.

*La Poétique d'Aristote*.... Par MM. ADOLPHE HATZFELD et MÉDÉRIC DUFOUR. Lille. 1899. Pp. lxxiii. 121.

MESSRS. Hatzfeld and Dufour give us a text with a translation opposite and very brief notes below, preceded by an introduction of sixty pages in which some of the main points involved in the *Poetics* are dealt with. The notes are terse and clear, but too few, brief, and elementary to be of much use, except to quite young students; difficulties are not discussed, and very little information is given as to points in the history of the drama. The translation seems to be in most places very accurate. But what do the editors mean by saying that οἱ τῶν ὀρχηστῶν (1. 3) is equivalent to οἱ ὀρχηστῆς? The notes on οὐχ ὄντι (4. 5) and πρὸς ὃ ἔστι (21. 4) are far from clear, and perhaps point to some misunderstanding. In 26. 1 the editors fail to see that λίαν goes with

φορτικῇ, and that in ἂν μὴ αὐτὸς προσθῇ the performer, not the poet, is meant. They do not quite seize the meaning of τὸ τερατώδες (14. 2). The text is very conservative, so much so, indeed, that it adheres to impossibilities like the Ἀθηναῖοι of 3. 3. One or two things which are, at any rate to me, novelties, do not recommend themselves. Such is the insertion of a stop after ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς τραγωδίας in 9. 3, and the theory given for 16. 5. The introduction puts clearly and well some of the main doctrines of the treatise, confirming and illustrating what is said from other Aristotelian writings. The most interesting part of it is the rejection of the 'physiological' or homoeopathic theory of the κάθαρσις. The editors contend that pity and fear are brought by tragedy to an Aristotelian mean and that comedy in like manner effects an *éducation du rire*.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

#### ZIMMERHAECKEL ON CAESAR'S RHINE-BRIDGE.

*C. Julius Caesars Rheinbrücke, Comm. de Bell. Gall.* iv., 17. Ein Rekonstruktionsversuch von F. ZIMMERHAECKEL, Sekondelieutenant. Mit 28 Figuren im Text und einer Tafel. 12 pp. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1899. 1 M.

THE author of this paper—a reprint from the 29th and 30th vols. of the *Zeitschrift für*

*Mathematischen und Naturwissenschaftlichen Unterricht*—has much the same title to be heard upon his subject as had Aug. von Cohausen, also a Prussian Officer of Engineers. As was to be expected, his criticisms are eminently practical, and to reconstruct the bridge as he conceives it, would, under his guidance, be perfectly simple to his own countrymen. Englishmen

might find it rather less easy, because of a certain looseness of language, and interchange of technical terms, which render Herr Zimmerhaeckel at times quite as difficult as Caesar.

Omitting minor problems, there are, as is well known, two great puzzles in Caesar's account of his bridge-building (*B. G.*, iv., 17), viz. (a) What were the *fibulae* wherewith the trestles were secured? and (b) What was the nature of the outworks—*defensores*—added to strengthen and secure the bridge from damage? As the Commentators have been unable heretofore to arrive at any agreement on either point, the opinion of a practical engineer, familiar moreover with their various views, ought to be of real value.

(a). As to the *fibulae*, all that Caesar tells us is that there were two at each end of each of the cross-beams (*trabes*) which combined with the great main piers (*tigna*) of the bridge to form the trestles; and that these *fibulae* served to hold the *trabes* and *tigna* in position. Nothing being said as to the material, shape, or mode of fixing them, it is not surprising that the Commentators have been tempted to indulge in a little amateur engineering. So Cohausen understands them as 'Durchstecker,' von Goeler as 'Spannriegel,' Kraner as 'Eiserne Bolzen,' Dr. Maurer as 'Keil,' Dr. Rheinhard as 'Zangen,' Köchly-Rüstow as 'Klammer,' and Napoleon as 'Diagonalverstrebung.' Various as these suggestions are, they at any rate do no violence to Caesar's Latin, and any one of them might reasonably serve the purpose in view. In the lack of information, no certainty is possible. Herr Zimmerhaeckel declares in favour of a modification of Cohausen's view, and believes that the *fibulae* were merely bars of undressed wood laid in the alternate acute angles of the X-cross formed by the junction of the horizontal *trabes* with the sloping *tigna*; viz., one *fibula* in the outer and lower angle, the other in the inner and upper angle. To hold them in place they were stoutly roped to each other, the essential point being that, while remaining firmly inter-connected, they should nevertheless move with freedom. This, he says, is a recognised method in modern bridge-building. His view is, at any rate, far the simplest yet proposed, and under the circumstances simplicity was, next to strength, the primary object.

(b). In regard to the *defensores*, the Commentators have displayed an equal freedom of fancy, but without the same excuse; for

Caesar has told us *in extenso* both the manner of constructing the outworks and the purpose which they were to serve. The passage runs:—

Ac nihilo secius sublicae et ad inferiorem partem fluminis oblique agebantur, quae pro ariete subiectae et cum omni opere coniunctae vim fluminis exciperent; et aliae item supra pontem mediocri spatio, ut, si arborum trunci sive naves deiendi operis essent a barbaris missae, his defensoribus earum rerum vis minueretur, neu ponti nocerent. (*B. G.*, iv., 17, §§ 9, 10).

It is here distinctly stated that the outworks on the down-stream side are made of *sublicae* arranged *oblique*; that they are beneath the bridge, and built into the fabric of it; and that their purpose is to shelter the piers of the bridge from the force of the stream. On the up-stream side they are constructed in exactly the same way (*item*), but some little distance away; and their purpose here is to protect the piers from the impact of floating objects such as logs or wrecking-ships.

I may perhaps be permitted to point out four points which cannot be ignored if the passage is to be rightly understood.

(1) *Sublica* signifies a *perpendicular* pile. The proof is in §4 of the same chapter, where Caesar says that the great main piers (*tigna*) were driven in the river-bed *non sublicae modo directe ad perpendicularum sed prone ac fastigate*. *Sublica* therefore cannot mean any sort of *sloping* pile.

(2) *Oblique* does not mean 'slanting from the perpendicular,' an idea which Caesar expresses in the passage just quoted by *prone* and *fastigate*. A reference to the Dictionary will show that the proper sense of *obliquus* is 'crosswise on the flat.' It is used e.g., of a snake crossing the line of a road, and here of a line of *sublicae* running athwart the line of the stream.

(3) *Excipere vim fluminis* is used only of an object which, being itself higher up the stream, covers and protects an object lower down. See e.g., Livy, xxi., 28. It cannot be made to mean 'resist the thrust of the stream.'

(4) *Item* can only mean that the arrangement of the *sublicae* on both sides of the bridge was in the main the same. The only differences were those mentioned—viz., in regard to position (*mediocri spatio*, contrasted with *cum omni opere coniunctae*) and in regard to purpose (*exciperent vim fluminis*, contrasted with *vis minueretur*, &c.).

With the single exception of G. Long—and I am indebted to Dr. Postgate for



pointing out to me that Long, years ago, enunciated a view practically identical with that which I had myself arrived at—I can find no commentator (whether English, German, or otherwise) who has explained the passage without violating Latinity in one or all of these four points. The *fons et origo mali* in the whole problem appears to be the blunder—I cannot trace its first exponent—of translating *excipere vim fluminis* as if it meant ‘receive or resist the thrust of the stream.’ From this it was inferred that the bridge required to be propped up, an idea which Caesar expressly contradicts; and henceforward, at any rate from Kraner’s time, the prop-theory has held the field. I am unable to discover a single commentator, Long excepted, since Kraner’s edition of 1855, who has not accepted the prop-theory in whole or part. Cohausen, acknowledging the presence of *item*, actually put props on both sides of the bridge! But the majority of German commentators from Von Goeler to Hamp have adopted the view approved also by Rheinhard, according to which there was on the down-stream side a prop, and on the up-stream side a V-shaped *pfahlsystem* in front of each pier. This view (which quite ignores *item*, disregards the sense of *sublicae* and *oblique*, and makes an absurdity of *vim fluminis excipere*) is approved also by Herr Zimmerhaeckel. It is the popular view in Germany, France, England and America, so far as I have been able to discover. In its simplest form it was enunciated by Kraner, confirmed in the Kraner-Dittenberger edition, and thence borrowed by Messrs. Bond and Walpole. Mr. St. G. Stock (Oxford Press, 1898) adopts it, as improved by Rheinhard, without question. The earlier Oxford edition by Moberly likewise has it, *plus* the impossible arrangement of *fibulae* which Napoleon invented. Messrs. Bryans and McDowall also follow Rheinhard, and Mr. Peskett (Cambridge Press, 1895) only differs in substituting for the V-shaped *pfahlsystem* a single pile slanting up stream—a really ingenious concession to that troublesome *item*!

I venture to suggest that the following explanation, in substance that of Long, is the correct one, if only on the ground that it does no violence to the Latin of the text. V-shaped stockades of perpendicular piles were driven into the river-bed in such a way that the apex of each pointed up stream

and its arms therefore lay slant-wise athwart the course of the stream. One such stockade was constructed to each pier of the bridge. As the piers on the down-stream side sloped up-stream, the *defensores* on this side were actually beneath the piers, the latter sloping over and resting upon them, so that the stockade served as a buttress (*pro ariete subiectae*), and pier and stockade could be securely fastened to one another (*cum omni opere coniunctae*). In no other position could the outwork serve *excipere vim fluminis*—i.e., to intercept the rush of the current against the down-stream piers. With the piers on the up-stream side it was different, for these sloped down-stream. As the *defensores* on this side were intended to intercept floating objects, obviously they could not be under the piers; and equally obviously, owing to the slope of the piers, the *sublicae* on this side could only be driven in at some little distance back (*mediocri spatio*); and this again explains why they were not on this side built in to the whole fabric, as were the corresponding works on the lower side.

This explanation gives the only possible value to *excipere vim fluminis*, to *item*, and to *oblique*, while it recognises also Caesar’s own idea of a *sublica*; and the engineering difficulties which it offers are none. The engineers who could manage the great piers would make light of driving these *sublicae*, though they might well have hesitated about handling the colossal ‘props’ of the popular view, even if they could find the trees of which to make them.

Long misunderstood the phrase *pro ariete subiectae*, and on certain other minor points he is in error, and his notes on the passage are not very clear, at times even inconsistent. But he had grasped the main points in the puzzle, and the illustration which he gives shows the *defensores* in the correct position, albeit, ridiculously attenuated in proportion to the rest of the Bridge. His edition was stereotyped as long ago as 1863, and has since been reissued constantly, which makes it the more curious that his explanation should have borne no fruit in the labours of so many later commentators. It would be interesting to learn whether the same explanation has occurred to any commentator of any other nation, only to be passed over in the same inexplicable silence.

A. H. ALLCROFT.

## SCHENKL ON GRATTIUS.

*Zur Kritik und Überlieferungsgeschichte des Grattius und anderer lateinischer Dichter, von HEINRICH SCHENKL (besonderer Abdruck aus dem vierundzwanzigsten Supplementband der Jahrbücher für classische Philologie). Leipzig (Teubner), 1898. (Pp. 98, viz. 383-480.) M. 3. 60.*

THIS is a valuable contribution to the study of the text of Grattius and establishes once for all the relationship of the different MSS. of the poet. But it is also something more. It cannot be too strongly recommended to the student of Latin textual criticism for the light which it throws on two stages in the history of, we may say, all Latin MSS., the stage of transcription from the old to the Carolingian minuscule and the stage immediately preceding the first printed editions. The perusal of Dr. Schenkl's critical apparatus, in which the variants in the sixteenth century copies made by Sannazaro are placed together under the text of the actual MS. which Sannazaro copied, teaches us how and to what extent we are to look for deviations in Renaissance MSS. from their originals. Every editor of Latin authors whose text depends on codices of this period will derive benefit from a study of this critical apparatus. The faults characteristic of Renaissance transcribers are however more or less familiar to us. The critical apparatus of such editions as Schneidewin's *Martial* gives satisfactory indication of them, although not so direct and cogent testimony as is presented to us here. But the textual corruption incident at the earlier period of transcription is, I think, not sufficiently apprehended by Latin editors. The ordinary text-books on Latin Palaeography supply us with a list of the contractions and the forms of letters used by Carolingian but not pre-Carolingian scribes. These contractions and forms of letters are

generally all that the average editor knows about Latin minuscule. And yet, if he reflect how slight change there was in minuscule writing from the introduction of the Carolingian script to the twelfth century, we shall see how little room there was for mistakes in transcription during all that period. The time of all others for corruption of Latin texts was the time when the old irregular minuscule, with its confused ligatures, its perplexingly similar letters, its capricious abbreviations, came to be transcribed into the smooth, regular, unmistakable Carolingian script. It is the knowledge of the peculiarities of pre-Carolingian minuscule that is of most service to an editor in the removal of the corruptions of transcription; and unfortunately, specimens of the early minuscule are few and far between and little information is supplied in the manuals of Latin Palaeography. Students will find of service the remarks of Dr. Schenkl on the peculiarities of the pre-Carolingian script of the parent MS. of Grattius in the Vienna Library (Vind. lat. 277) and his reproductions on p. 477 of some of its characteristic ligatures. But above all they should carefully peruse the facsimile of a page of this MS. in Chatelet's *Paléographie des Classiques latins* (plate 101) and employ Schenkl's critical apparatus to discover the deviations from this original that occur in (1) the Codex Thuaneus, a Carolingian minuscule MS., (2) the transcriptions by Sannazaro. It is high time that the old style of baseless emendation were abandoned and that every editor should be able to account on good palaeographical grounds for any corruption which he ventures to ascribe to the traditional text. The study of books like Dr. Schenkl's Grattius will help to bring about this desired result.

W. M. LINDSAY.

## BRIEF NOTICES.

*Xenophon. Hellenica* I, II. Edited with Introduction and Notes by G. M. EDWARDS. Pp. xlviii., 168. Cambridge University Press. 1899. Price 3s. 6d.

*Suetonius. History of Twelve Caesars.*

Translated into English by PHILEMON HOLLAND, anno 1606. With an Introduction by CHARLES WHIBLEY. 2 vols. Pp. xxxviii., 283; vi., 311. Nutt. 1899 24s. nett.

The  
P  
N  
C  
C  
P  
of  
m  
SCH  
I  
Z  
M  
7-  
Lati  
du  
H  
H  
of  
CH  
18  
tra  
Carm  
Ri  
A.  
sio  
Gree  
Xe  
H.  
at  
18  
wr  
Foru  
By  
Ed  
Pri  
Sepa  
kla  
W.  
Teu

THE  
title  
suffici  
and w  
editio  
Hellen  
judgm  
featur  
gramm  
most  
princi  
from  
judici  
consci  
hetero  
are so  
p. 14  
other  
Goodw  
matter

*The Works of Horace rendered into English Prose.* With Life, Introduction, and Notes by WILLIAM COUTTS, M.A., Senior Classical Master, George Watson's College, Edinburgh; formerly Assistant Professor of Humanity in the University of Aberdeen. Pp. xxxi., 240. Longmans. 1898. Price 5s. nett.

SCHANZ. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur.* I. Theil. Die römische Literatur in der Zeit der Republik (2nd ed.). Beck, München. 1898. Pp. xviii., 421. Mk. 7-50.

*Latin Manuscripts.* An Elementary Introduction to the use of Critical Editions for High School and College Classes. By HAROLD W. JOHNSTON, Ph.D., Professor of Latin in the University of Indiana, Chicago. Scott, Foreman & Company. 1897. Pp. 155, with Plates and Illustrations. Price \$3.

*Carmina Anglica Latine reddidit* Leo Josia Richardson, Sancti Francisci apud Carolum A. Murdoch. 1899. (Unpag'd: 7 versions).

*Greek Prose Phrase-book based on Thucydides, Xenophon, Demosthenes, Plato.* By H. W. AUDEN, M.A., Assistant Master at Fettes College. Blackwoods, Edinburgh. 1899. Pp. ix., 112 (interleaved with writing paper). Price 1s. 6d.

*Forum Latinum.* A First Latin Book. By EDWARD VERNON ARNOLD, Litt.D. Edward Arnold. 1899. Pp. viii., 312. Price 3s.

*Separat abdrücke aus den Jahrbüchern für klassische Philologie.* By E. DRERUP, W. OTTO, JOH. SCHWAB, and E. DIEHL. Teubner, 1898-99.

THE name of Mr. G. M. Edwards on the title page of a school commentary is a sufficient guarantee that it will be practical and well adapted to its object, and in this edition of books I. and II. of Xenophon's *Hellenics* his careful preparation and cautious judgment do not fail. The most noticeable feature of the book is the pains bestowed on grammatical elucidations, and perhaps its most original the revival of the *variorum* principle. Mr. Edwards quotes freely from the authorities which he has used so judiciously, and the quotation is assigned in conscientious capitals. The effect is a little heterogeneous, especially as the quotations are sometimes banal enough, e.g. that on p. 140 on the policy of Nicias, while at other times, as on p. 153 (III. iv. 18 from Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses*), they include matter actually irrelevant or misleading.

In textual matters Mr. Edwards is conservative but not unduly so; and, as he has accepted a correction of mine at II. iii. 31, I will suggest to him that in I. vi. 32 οὐδὲν μὴ κάκιον οἰκείται, which he justly stigmatizes as ungrammatical, requires only to be changed to οἰκῆται; the pres. subjunctive is not only more appropriate but it has a parallel in Xenophon himself (*Anab.* II. 2. 12, quoted by Mr. Edwards on *Anab.* IV. 8. 13). Also that at II. iii. 36, while παρακηκοῖναι 'failed to hear,' (Wytténbach) is undoubtedly an excellent emendation of παρανενοηκῆναι, Xenophon may have written παρανενοηκῆναι, 'failed to comprehend,' which is obviously nearer to the letters and may be supported by Plato, *Theæt.* 195 A, where the two verbs are joined, παρακούουσι καὶ παρανοοῦσι. In a new edition Mr. Edwards might warn his youthful readers against copying the un-Attic forms as ἔδωκαν (p. 85) and un-Attic usages as the employment of σύν (p. 147) which abound in Xenophon.

All interested in monuments of Latin and English literature will be glad that old Philemon Holland's 'splendid' translation of Suetonius is once more accessible. The translation, of whose exterior appearance it is enough to say that it is in Mr. Nutt's Tudor Series, is preceded by a literary introduction from the vigorous and facile pen of Mr. C. Whibley. Reprints, like this, should of course follow their originals *litteratim*; but this should not be held to preclude the editor from correcting in a note slight errors of the printer or, it may be, lapses of the author. It would not, for example, have been deemed officious to set right the spelling of καὶ ἵνα συντιμῶ πάντα μαλᾶγμα *Moecharum* (vol. i. p. 268) or (*ib.* p. 248) to have made metre and sense of the quotation from Euripides πολλὴν πρόνοιαν ἔσχεν δυσχέρως πείσιν—a very ludicrous erratum. Let us hope that the success of this translation of Suetonius may be such as to tempt some publisher to give us the Livy and the Pliny; for of no two Latin authors are good translations into English more needed. To this hope I would join a suggestion. Let the translation be printed as it stands; but let notes be added, correcting the mistakes into which the old translator has fallen and bringing up his work to the level of our present knowledge. Such a translation would be a boon to the lovers of literature and the lovers of scholarship.

It would not be easy to find a greater contrast to Philemon Holland than Mr.

William Coutts. The first paragraph of the preface to his prose translation of Horace gives his view of a translator's duties: 'A version should be produced at once literal and idiomatic.' This sentence with its absurd antithesis may detain us for a moment. Mr. Coutts mixes up literality and closeness, and confuses a 'construe' with a translation. A literal construe is a very useful thing in its way and one which a schoolmaster is most fitted to produce: but we do not understand Mr. Coutts to have aimed at a crib. (He marks the quantities of the proper names presumably for those who have not the Latin before them.) This confusion has its effect upon his versions, of which we now give specimens taken at random: Odes ii. 4. 21 'her arms and looks and shapely calves I praise heartwhole.' iii. 27, 50-60 'O thou, whoever of the gods thou art that hearest this, would I might wander naked amidst lions. Or ere unsightly decay seize on these comely cheeks, or the tide of life ebb from their tender prey, in all my beauty I long to feast the tigers. 'Mean Eurôpé' my absent father chides me. 'Why delay to die? from yonder ash-tree you can bruise your neck suspended by the girdle which happily has followed you.' (Just above 'infamem—iuuenum' (of the beast into which Europa's lover transformed himself) is translated 'the infamous bullock'; what does Mr. Coutts think a *bullock* is?). *Satires* ii. 4. 91 'Add the look and bearing of the author, the sight of whom you, blessed man, don't value much, because you have had the privilege; while I am possessed with no ordinary anxiety to be enabled to approach the hidden springs and quaff the precepts of the blessed life.' *Ib.* 7. 8 sq. 'Often was Priscus marked with three rings' [1 ringworm], 'again with his left hand bare of them; he lived so irregular (!) as to change his stripe from hour to hour.' *Epistles* i. 10. 15-17 'Is there a spot where the winters are milder, where a more pleasant breeze allays alike the fury of the Dogstar and the commotions of the Lion, when once he has gone mad by receiving the stings of the sun?' What are we to say of the above renderings except that they give only too much support to a view of Horace which a friend of mine once received in an answer in examination; 'Horace had a real love of literature: but he did not contribute to it, unless you count the Odes!' Mr. Coutts does not often abandon his principle of literality, and where he does he is not very fortunate; witness his rendering of Epode xvii. 50 sqq. 'and on you the midwife attends (this is to

translate 'tuo cruore rubros pannos lauit') whenever you sally abroad (exilis!) strong after your delivery.' We learn from the preface that Mr. Coutts' version has been revised by three of his 'friends and former pupils': but it will be easily seen by a comparison of the extracts given above with the Latin that this revision has by no means been complete.

The first edition of Part I. of M. Schanz's *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* was not noticed in this Review, and of Part II. the present reviewer was obliged to express a not altogether favourable opinion. So he takes this opportunity of saying that the second edition with its considerable corrections and enlargement (from 304 pages to 421) may be recommended to all who desire a history of Roman literature clearly and interestingly written, full and accurate in its facts and moderate and sensible in its judgments. It does not indeed altogether supersede the work of Teuffel, but it is worthy to stand beside it.

Since the elements of textual criticism found a place in Dr. Gow's well-known *Companion*, from which several paragraphs in Dr. Johnston's *Latin Manuscripts* are drawn, they have been considered a not altogether superfluous ornament in the school curriculum. Masters who view them with favour will find Prof. Johnston's book a very useful adjunct to their teaching. Its get up is attractive—a convenient quarto with wide margins, clear type and numerous illustrations. These latter include several facsimiles taken from Chatelain's *Paléographie* and one of a page of the now famous *Codex Romanus* of Catullus furnished by Prof. W. G. Hale. It may be mentioned by the way that it is not as good a reproduction as that published in the *American Journal of Archaeology* (1897, No. 1). The treatment of the subject is clear and not uninteresting, but rather thin and in parts even deficient. For example the guide to the collections of classical manuscripts in Europe requires revision. No account of Oxford libraries is complete which omits those of Christ Church, Corpus Christi, and New Colleges, nor of those of Cambridge if silent upon that of Corpus Christi.

One who has never seen any offspring of the American *Camenae* till now is rather at a loss to know by what standard the Latin versifying of Mr. Richardson should be



judged; but by cis-Atlantic ones they are sufficiently remarkable. The methods of pioneers are apt to be a little masterful, nor would I count it for much if, when Mr. Richardson wants to express 'at San Francisco,' Saint Francis has to provide himself with a locative. 'The beaver has to climb the tree' again in Mr. Richardson's Alcaic Stanza in version No. IV.

Whose Titan angels, Gabriel, Abdiel,  
Starr'd from Jehovah's gorgeous armouries,  
Tower, as the deep-domed empyrean  
Rings to the roar of an angel onset.

Cuius perampli Gabriel, Abdiel  
ipsa antra tangunt viribus angeli  
pleni Jehovahae cum profundo  
classica concinuere caelo.

For *Gabriel* as a dactyl Tennyson is the first classical witness, and Mr. Richardson the first Latin one. Prudentius is freer than Horace, and his editors, in his treatment of prosody: but Prudentius never took such a liberty. *perampli* does, very unhappily for itself, recall Horace's 'ter amplum Geryonen.' 'classica concinuere caelo' is the only line in the quatrain which is like Latin poetry; but it is not Horatian. Shakespeare's refrain

'Come hither, come hither, come hither!

Here shall he see

No enemy

But winter and rough weather.'

is transmuted by Mr. Richardson into the following Sapphics:—

'adsit huc! oro properet pedes, nam  
perditores hic nequedum fatigant  
sive frigus seu "nebulae malusque  
Iuppiter urget."

Mr. Richardson does better than this in some of his seven translations; but it is at the expense of the English original. At the end of the booklet is an 'Index Metrorum,' a provident addition. We might otherwise have been doubtful of the metre of the version of

He who would have beautiful Roses in his garden

Must first have beautiful Roses in his heart.

Visne rosae specie praecllentes tibi  
crescant?

est usus fieri primum in corde rosas.

But now we know that it is a Californian elegiac.

All efforts to raise the present low level of junior Greek prose composition must be received with approval. Mr. H. W. Auden's

NO. CXVIII. VOL. XIII.

interleaved and classified collection of Greek phrases will be useful, though its neglect of accents is unscholarly and from an editor of a series of school classics deplorable. Within ten lines we have *ἔναι* (twice), *ἄμοσε* (twice), *ἐπίοντας*, *ἀνπροστατω*, *ἀτακτῶς*. But Mr. Auden can do worse than this: witness page 67 where within two lines we have *εἶλον*, and *στανρῶματι*.

Professor E. V. Arnold's *Forum Latinum*, which is 'specially intended for the use of those who begin Latin at a rather later age than usual,' is in several respects a notable production. The preface states an important but much neglected principle in words which we recommend to the compilers of similar introductions. 'Those who study a modern language seek to acquaint themselves by ear and eye with the vocabulary and idiom of ordinary conversation, before they pass to the more elaborate style of literature. The endeavour is here made to apply this method to Latin, and to put before the student a collection of detached sentences, graduated in difficulty, and fairly representative of the simple Latin which was once to be heard daily from the mouths of educated Romans in the market-places and in private gatherings.' The sentences referred to are constructed with care and ingenuity; but Dr. Arnold might with advantage have given more attention to the subject-matter of his sentences. This is rather too arid and severe: and sometimes, as in

'The girl took up a sword and overcame the wolf,'

or

'The love of birds led the girls into the wood.'

it may raise a smile. Another point in which Prof. Arnold is ahead of most of his contemporaries is the weight which he assigns to correct pronunciation of quantity. The neglect of this is a blot upon the classical education of the country. It is monstrous that it should be possible to set up for a classical scholar and (what is far worse) as a classical teacher and not be able to read a passage of Latin poetry without making two out of three lines unmetrical. What irony is it when these products of elementary mistraining hold forth on the poetical beauties of Virgil and Horace! Your public school-master smiles at the foreigner who calls a 'ship' a 'sheep'; but with perfect gravity directs his class to pronounce the Latin for 'bone' and that for 'mouth' as *oss*. All

F F

through *Forum Latinum* we see the same independence. Dr. Arnold studies the conditions of each problem of teaching for himself, and refuses to run in the groove. We are a little startled to find the conjugation of our verbs begin with *capio* until we remember how very much used are these verbs in *-io*. Both nouns and verbs are arranged according to their stem, with which no fault can be found; but then the infinitive should have been placed at the head of the paradigm and not the indicative present. The distinction between quantity (short and long) of vowels and weight (heaviness and lightness) of syllables is a clear and practical one. But we cannot equally approve of the new name for the Deliberative or Dubitative Subjunctive, the Subjunctive of the Dilemma, though we may readily grant it to be no worse than the old one. It is only necessary to take Dr. Arnold's first example 'quid agāmus?' *What are we to do?* and change the order of the words *Let us do—what?* to see that the subjunctive differs in no way from that of 'agāmus hōc' in which no one has ever seen or will see dilemma, doubt or deliberation. No one can hope to write an elementary Latin book without some mistakes, nor is

this book quite free; for example, the rule for the conversion of questions in reported speech (p. 275) is incorrect. But as a whole, it may be cordially recommended to all teachers of elementary Latin. Even if they do not teach from it, they may learn from it.

Amongst *Separat-abdrücke* (from the 24th supplement volume of the *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie*) deserving of the attention of scholars, we mention the following: *Ueber die bei den Attischen Rednern eingelegten Urkunden*, by Engelbert Drerup, a useful monograph on the much-disputed question of the authenticity of the documents inserted in the texts of the Attic orators, *Nomina propria Latina oriunda a participiis perfecti*, conlegit Gualterus Otto and a companion one *N.p.L. oriunda a participiis praesentis activi, futuri passivi, futuri activi* scr. Joannes Schwab, and, from the 25th supplement volume of the same, another elaborate monograph, for which also the *Corpus Inscr. Lat.* has been ransacked, and which is of importance for Romance as well as for Latin scholars, *De M finali epigraphica* scr. Ernestus Diehl. These monographs are all published by Messrs. Teubner. J. P. P.

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

### CAMPBELL'S RELIGION IN GREEK LITERATURE.

*Religion in Greek Literature*; a Sketch in Outline by LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1898. x, 424 pp. Price 15s.

In 1894-5 Prof. Campbell as Gifford lecturer in the University of St. Andrews gave two courses of lectures on the Religion of the Ancient Greeks. The present volume claims to embody one portion only of the subject then treated. *Religion in Greek Literature* is however understood to include much more than a mere summary of the religious opinions expressed by the principal Greek writers. The author defines his task in a liberal spirit (p. 5): 'I do not propose... to give anything like a complete account of Greek religion. Mr. Farnell's learned work on the *Cults of the Greek States* supplies a want which has long been felt in England,

and deals with the subject of Hellenic worship on lines that are more rational than those followed by many Continental writers. But there is still room for an attempt to exhibit in a continuous treatise the way in which the ritual and mythology reacted upon the higher minds in Hellas, as this is clearly reflected in classical Greek literature. The aim of my endeavour is to trace, not origins chiefly, but rather tendencies—not whence, but rather how and whitherward the religious consciousness in Greece was moving.' Accordingly Prof. Campbell discusses at length not merely the moral and religious ideas to be found in Homer or Herodotus but also such phenomena as hero-worship and the mysteries; he even finds it advisable to incorporate a résumé of Laconian and Athenian cults. In short, the scope of the book is more comprehensive than might have been inferred from its title.

Fifty pages of introductory matter lead up to the subject proper. Various types of

primitive worship are touched upon (animism, reverence of plants and animals, procreation-cults, nature-worship, adoration of ancestors). Certain descriptions of the distinctively Greek spirit are set aside as inadequate (beauty, reason, serenity, moderation). The relations of religion to mythology, to superstition, and to secular life, are indicated. Then follows a somewhat tentative treatment of the early age of Greece with its 'welter of facts and opinions still awaiting settlement.' The view taken is that an immigrant Aryan stock was modified through intercourse (1) with aboriginal tribes and (2) with Semitic traders, but through all modifications retained its identity. The religion of the family in the patriarchal form was its essential core; the institutions of marriage and inheritance were never obliterated; and the sacredness of the hearth persisted through all changes of public ritual. But the Aryan tradition thus evidenced repeatedly absorbed into itself (1) old-world usages that clung to the localities successively occupied and (2) foreign influences operating chiefly at such centres as Argos or Thebes.

An excellent chapter on the *Iliad* characterises each member of the Homeric pantheon and discusses the moral features in the poem. Among various points of interest raised is the question whether heroes were already worshipped. Prof. Campbell inclines to the belief that, as a rule, the poet deliberately and for artistic reasons ignores the divine honours paid to them in his own day. To the same convenient assumption of selective taste he attributes (pp. 54, 68, 76, cp. p. 144) the absence of many primitive customs, superstitions, and immoralities, that appear for the first time in post-homeric literature. A corresponding chapter on the *Odyssey* traces further the beginnings of hero-worship, collects available evidence for the details of early ritual, and notes an advance in mythological and ethical conceptions. We are next taken more rapidly through the poetry of Hesiod, Theognis, the elegiac and lyric writers, and the Homeric hymns. After this the subject of hero-worship is resumed, and sundry other growths more or less closely connected with the transitional period are considered (panhellenic influences, Spartan institutions, Greater Greece, the birth of philosophy). Typical of the succeeding age are Pindar and Herodotus, between whom a good contrast is drawn. But the account given of religion in Pindar is not altogether satisfactory; for, though it makes true points, it neglects great and

important ones. It is surely misleading to say that in the Pindaric odes 'the gods . . . retain all the fulness of individual life' (p. 171). Rather, the gods are omniscient and omnipotent; and the thought of divine perfection is already leading on towards that of divine unity. The gods of Homer and Hesiod were distinguished in part at least by their defects. Pindar allows no ugliness physical or moral to taint them. His theology, perhaps under the influence of philosophy, has been purified and elevated till his separate deities are but traditional names for one God. Again, as regards human life Pindar's creed was two-fold: (1) recognise your limitations; and (2) make the most of them. Where, as happens not unfrequently, either of these commandments occurs apart from the other, we may easily mistake the poet's attitude. Doctrines of this sort should have been outlined with a firm hand, as is done e.g. by Croiset, *Hist. de la litt. grecque*, ii. 375-386. Prof. Campbell's treatment of Herodotus with its distinction between his references to contemporary belief and his own religious opinions is clearer and more adequate. Chapters ix-xii take a survey of the Greek world during the Pentekontaetia. Most of the religious issues of the age are here noticed, including some topics that are only partially or indirectly connected with worship, such as Idealism in Art and the rise of Medical Schools. Due stress is laid on the fact that 'the experience of the race was outgrowing its traditions, and the more advanced minds were having recourse either to innovations in mythology and ritual, or to philosophical speculation' (p. 204). Interest is next concentrated on Athens, and a fairly full account is given of Athenian cults (pp. 209-237). Demeter-worship involves a discussion of the Thesmophoria and the Eleusinia. The latter rite is interestingly handled, the parallelism of the Homeric hymn to Demeter and the celebration at Eleusis being drawn out in detail. Foucart's daring hypothesis (*L'origine et la nature des mystères d'Eleusis*, 1895) with regard to the Egyptian source of the whole Demeter-cult is neither accepted nor rejected; but parts of it have a strong attraction for the author. He thinks that the Thesmophoria and the Eleusinia may have been originally identical in character, but gradually modified through special influences. He admits, however, that we are by no means forced to consider this original form as Egyptian. On the whole, he concludes, 'it is at least conceivable that some Asiatic

influence working upon an Aryan village rite may sufficiently account for all that is known of the religion of Demeter before the seventh century' (p. 241). Another question of importance here discussed is the relation of Orphism to Pythagoreanism. Prof. Campbell harks back to the old view that, so far as their points of resemblance are concerned, both systems had a common source—Egyptian or otherwise—rather than that either was indebted directly to the other. Accepting Diels' theory that mystic doctrines of similar complexion arose simultaneously at various centres, he supposes that 'besides Egyptian influence, or even apart from it, some phase of pantheistic or at least of ascetic and pessimistic teaching, of which no clear trace remains, existed antecedently both to Pythagoras and Onomacritus' (p. 249). Dionysiac worship, the theme of Chapter xii, brings us back again to the strictly literary aspect of religion. Most writers on Aeschylus sow with the sack the epithets 'solemn,' 'awful,' 'majestic,' 'stupendous.' Prof. Campbell in a fresh and delightful passage dwells rather upon 'a progress from discord towards harmony, from Chaos to Cosmos, from tyranny and rebellion . . . to the triumphs of liberty and order,' and shows how 'the dark traditions of the past, which it is his cue to dramatise, are transfigured with a light from heaven, calculated to lead mankind into a more excellent way.' An interesting sequence of extracts proves that the new light dawned upon the poet himself with increasing clearness. Less space is given to Sophocles in whom no such sudden illumination can be found: it is, however, remarked that in some respects, *e.g.* as regards the law of retribution, the later plays and especially the *Philoctetes* contain the results of maturer reflection. Before proceeding to Euripides Prof. Campbell indicates the philosophic drift of contemporary thought and the religious reaction that it provoked, aptly describing the fin de siècle mood as an 'intermediate mental condition . . . in which sceptical doubts and questionings grew side by side with religious anxieties and an increasing scrupulosity of observance.' The views of the ordinary Athenian about divine government are illustrated by quotations from Andocides and Thucydides. The ten pages devoted to Euripides are one of the best parts of the book. Prof. Campbell's interpretation is shrewd and sound. He does not believe in the view that the poet, with a profoundly moral design, so handles the legends that the common folk are enter-

tained, while the more intelligent detect inconsistencies and draw their own salutary conclusions. Robert Browning with his master-word 'There are no gods, no gods; | Glory to God, who saves Euripides!' took the poet too seriously. In truth, towards the end of the fifth century it was no longer the tragedian but the rhetorician or the sophist who was the acknowledged teacher of the age. Euripides' métier was to interest, not to instruct: had not the *θεαποκρίαι* already begun? Besides, traditions that are losing their reality are not on that account consciously derided and discarded. 'Men do not so easily divest themselves of the garments of the past; for a time at least they content themselves with shaping them anew, and patching them with vivid colours taken from present things. They do not at once realise that the new piece will rend the old.' For the rest, Euripides' scepticism may have been deeper than is commonly assumed: the pathetic complications of his dramas had more reality both for him and for his audience than their conventional closure. The remainder of the book is concerned with the Aufklärung heralded by the sophists and brought to its zenith by Plato. A good chapter on Socrates and the Socratics deals separately with the historical and the Platonic Socrates. The presentation of Plato's own teaching rests of course on Prof. Campbell's well-known theories about the chronological order of the dialogues. He truly observes that in the later writings Plato's ethical conviction assumes more and more the nature of a religious confidence, while retaining unshaken its essentially metaphysical foundation. 'For once in the history of Greek thought religion, philosophy, and ethics are interfused' (p. 350). Here is the culminating point for the historian of Greek religion. But justice is done to the genius of Plato's great rival. 'Religion is not the word that first occurs to one in thinking of Aristotle. Yet in steadily regarding him one is aware of an elevation and a colossal greatness which is not dissociated from religion in the truest sense. The very keystone of his philosophy consists in a conception of the divine life, and of the divine nature, which is really sublime. The description of the philosophic life in *Ethics* x, if more calm, is hardly less impressive than the speech of Diotima in the *Symposium*; and the account of God in *Metaphysics* xii is in a similar strain.' A few pages are added on the religious opinions of the post-Aristotelian schools and such 'cultivated persons' as

Paul  
an  
elem  
look  
the  
A  
wor  
arch  
freq  
tabl  
Ital  
ture  
pres  
mor  
ever  
p. 2  
mos  
duri  
that  
iden  
ἐφ  
been  
and  
zer,  
cour  
p. 2  
godd  
zer,  
whet  
Cyre  
weig  
Denk  
Welc  
with  
to 'a  
the l  
ment  
onwa  
been  
ples  
Taf.  
mark  
sinist  
the p  
in his  
On  
sensit  
one d  
resear  
prehis  
scure  
classi  
warni  
presen  
seduct  
certain  
invest  
that l  
and ul  
ing th



Pausanias, Plutarch, and Lucian. Finally, an interesting estimate is made of those elements in Greek thought which may be looked upon as a permanent contribution to the religious inheritance of the world.

A significant feature of Prof. Campbell's work is the extensive use that it makes of archaeological evidence. Inscriptions are frequently cited, including the mystic gold tablets lately found in Greek tombs of S. Italy, Sicily, and Crete. Architecture, sculpture, painting and the minor arts are all pressed into the service, and often point a moral fitly enough. Some peccadillos, however, should be corrected. The allusion on p. 234 to 'the temple of Aphrodite Pandemos, said to have been founded by Phaedra during her passion for Hippolytus,' assumes that the temple of Aphrodite Pandemos was identical with the sanctuary of Aphrodite ἐφ' Ἰππολύτῳ—an identification which has been rightly called in question: see Harrison and Verrall, *Myth. and Mon.*, p. 333 f., Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. ii., p. 243 f. 'The string-course of marble pigeons' mentioned on p. 235 belonged not to 'this Troezenian goddess' but to Aphrodite Pandemos: Frazer, *ibid.*, p. 245 f. Again, it is dubious whether the figure of Arcesilaus, king of Cyrene, on the famous vase that depicts the weighing of silphium-bales (Baumeister *Denkm.* iii., 1664) is 'a manifest caricature': Welcker thought so, but Jahn disagreed with him. In any case it does not amount to 'a proof of the unpopularity of one of the kings' (p. 157). On p. 186 the statement that 'Xerxes, in Herodotus, is led onwards by a spiteful deity' might have been illustrated by the Darius-vase at Naples (*Handbuch*: Atlas zur Arch. d. Kunst, Taf. xiv., D), in some ways the most remarkable vase in existence: it shows the sinister figure of ἈΓΑΓΗ sent down from the presence of Zeus to delude the monarch in his council-chamber.

On the other hand Prof. Campbell is sensible of a certain danger attaching to one department of archaeology. 'Recent researches,' he says, 'into the culture of prehistoric times have tended rather to obscure the abiding interest of the age of classical literature in Greece' (p. v.). This warning is not indeed uncalled for at the present day. One of the most subtle and seductive forms of disproportionate study is certainly that which interests a man in the investigation of origins to such an extent that he omits to trace subsequent growth and ultimate decay. But intent upon avoiding this peril the author goes too far in the

opposite direction and somewhat underrates the importance of primitive customs and cults in the general development of Greek religion. They are, he contends, 'the leaf-mould out of which it springs, whose quality is indicated by the weeds that grow upon it; but they have little to do either with the deeper roots or the spreading branches' (p. 14). The fact is that primeval sentiment and superstition were so persistent in Greek life as to form an appreciable element in the highest thoughts of speculative philosophy. It might, for instance, be argued that Plato's deification of the natural kinds is but the last term of a series whose starting-point was the animal-worship of the Mycenaean age. And if the metaphysician himself was not wholly free from such traditions, the religious attitude of the people at large is often unintelligible without them. We demur then to statements of the following kind: 'To suppose . . . that any light can be thrown upon the spirit and meaning of Euripides by connecting the action of the *Bacchae* with some ritual of which the traces remain, say, amongst the Russian peasantry—though the process may be ingenious, and some such far-off connection may have a real existence—is a mode of commentary which confuses more than it enlightens' (p. 14). The allusion is presumably to Mr. Bather's able article on 'The Problem of the *Bacchae*' in the *J.H.S.* xiv. 244—263. But the choice of this example is an unfortunate one; for it might well be maintained that the primitive character of the cult portrayed in the *Bacchae* throws a most valuable light upon the spirit and meaning of Euripides. May not part of the poet's purpose have been to recall men's minds from latter-day subtleties to fundamental instincts and to advocate a form of religion which, as distinguished from most Greek cults, drew largely upon the emotions of its devotees, rousing and raising them to an enthusiastic elevation otherwise unattainable? Some such purpose is indeed half suspected by Prof. Campbell when he comes to consider the play more closely (pp. 309—311). Again, we are told that Xenophon's picture of Ischomachus training his young wife, 'idealised though it may be, teaches us more about Attic religion than the information that the person thus instructed had danced the bear-dance at ten years old, or had carried the sacred basket in honour of Athena at fourteen' (p. 339). It does teach us more about Attic religion, if by that we mean the motives and aspirations of the

Attic moralist: but it may be surmised that in the mind of Ischomachus' wife the beardance and the basket-carrying bulked larger than the protreptics of her husband.

This failure to appreciate the part played by primitive and popular modes of thought here and there betrays the author into a positive misinterpretation of facts. Looking backwards from a civilised to a semi-civilised age he falls occasionally into the error of explaining early customs from a later standpoint. He tells us, for example, that the priests of Zeus at Dodona 'still in Homer's time lay upon the ground, no doubt watching over the life of the tree, *not taking time even to wash their feet*'! (p. 38). The real meaning of this singular practice is obscure, and it may be questioned whether Dr. Leaf and Mr. Bayfield have got to the bottom of the matter when they assert (on *Il.* xvi. 233) that 'the Helloi sleep on the ground and do not wash their feet, as preserving the habits of a more primitive time, with the conservatism which marks all cults.' Dr. Jevons (*Introd. Hist. Rel.*, p. 78 f.) shows that at an early stage of social development holy persons are frequently forbidden to wash, perhaps lest the taboo-infection should be conveyed by the water to others. He compares (*ibid.* p. 63) the *ὑποφῆται ἀνιπτόποδες* of Dodona with the priest and priestess of Artemis Ὑμνία, whose washings were not like those of common folk (Paus. viii. 13, 1), and also (*ibid.* p. 365) with the Eleusinian Demeter who abstained from washing for nine days (*h. hom.* v. 50 f.). The epithet *χαμαῖεναι* is best explained by the oracular powers ascribed to the Earth. To sleep on it was to be in close contact with its peculiar virtues and ensured true dreams, &c. Gaia was honoured at Dodona in connexion with Zeus (Paus. x. 12, 10), and Drexler in Roscher, *Lex.* I. ii. 1572, 54, thinks that this was no accidental association, but due to her character as 'wahr-sagende Gottheit.' An analogous case is that of the Flamen Dialis, the feet of whose bedstead were smeared with fine mud (Gell. x. 15), perhaps—so Mr. Frazer suggested in the *Class. Rev.* ii. 322—as a substitute for sleeping on the ground. It was of importance that he too should receive oracles in dreams; hence possibly the further restriction which forbade him to touch or even name beans (Gell. x. 15, cp. Plut. *quaest. conviv.* viii. 10, 1). Again, we must get back to naïve and unsophisticated notions if we are to understand why, when the horse of Achilles breaks into human speech, it is the Erinyes who check his utterance

(*Il.* xix. 418). It will not do to say that the Erinyes 'seem here to personify a law of nature' (p. 70): Homer was not Sophocles. We must recollect that the Greek mind in its infancy imagined beasts as well as men to be capable of doing or suffering wrong. This is only a particular application of the general principle that savages regard the souls of animals as human (Tylor, *Prim. Culture*, i. 467, ii. 230), and it certainly survived among the Greeks into historic times. Animals were actually tried for murder at the Prytaneum (Aristot. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 57, cp. Plat. *Legg.* 873 D). A moral lesson is drawn from animal life in the fable of Hesiod, *O.D.* 203 ff. Archilochus, *frag.* 88, Bgk., says of Zeus, *σοὶ δὲ θηρίων | ὕβρις τε καὶ δίκη μέλει*. Aeschylus, *Ag.* 59, makes Apollo or Pan or Zeus send the Erinyes to avenge the outraged vultures. There was even a proverb *εἰσὶ καὶ κυνῶν Ἐρινύες* (*Paroem. Gr.* i. 397). The Erinyes, then, were the punishers of wrong-doing amongst animals as much as amongst men. And here the horse Xanthus, who had just foretold that Achilles should fall *θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνέρι*, was about to reveal too much: he is therefore stopped in the act by the Erinyes. Prof. Campbell is entrapped into a similar anachronism when he states (p. 214 f.) that in the cult of Artemis 'the rite of initiation, by which young girls were consecrated to her service, was fancifully associated with her Arcadian favourite, the bear,' and recalls Lobeck's suggestion 'that *ἀρκτος* as applied to one of these young catechumens may have been originally derived from *ἀρχεσθαι*, "to begin." The word once chosen would soon,' he urges, 'come to be identified with the animal whom the goddess loved.' But this is to forget that the *ἀρκτεία* does not stand alone. The *πελειάδες* at Dodona, the *μέλισσαι* and *έσσηνες* at Delphi and Ephesus, have indeed been assailed by the rationalist: but what of the *ταῦροι* of Poseidon at Ephesus (Athen. x. 425 C.) and the *ἵπποι* of the Iobaccheia (Wernicke in Pauly-Wissowa, II. i. 1171, 53)? Can they all be explained away by means of popular etymology? Besides, Prof. Campbell himself admits that 'the worship of animals and the strange rites attending it . . . left undoubted traces on Greek culture' (p. 8). Is not the *ἀρκτεία* precisely one of these traces? On p. 63 Poseidon's powers as an earth-shaker are attributed to 'a natural association between the raging billows and the earthquake by which, as in the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, the earth is rolled in surges to and fro.' This conception

of so  
for p  
was  
folia  
(Pau  
Ridd  
black  
iii. 6  
the  
victi  
powe  
Ge (.  
32 f  
Hero  
at P  
heroe  
Stral  
848),  
120),  
chth  
accou  
black  
been  
god  
pirate  
sunri  
(p. 1  
i. 133  
pictu  
and a  
it pro  
Paus  
Spart  
merel  
primi  
An  
this i  
foreign  
Greek  
apart  
Dana  
Prof.  
holdin  
imper  
(pp. 1  
'the  
immor  
meter  
mate  
differ  
The I  
which  
is also  
Rel., p  
Abstin  
spell  
Dict.  
vol. i  
Fouca  
origin

of seismic waves is perhaps too advanced for primitive reflection; yet, it is true, there was in Arcadia an oak-forest with waving foliage which went by the name of Πέλαγος (Paus. viii. 11, 1, 5, 10). Less probable is Riddell's conjecture, adopted on p. 90, that black bulls were offered to Poseidon (*Od.* iii. 6) because of 'the darkness of the deep, the ἔρεβος ὕφαλον of Sophocles.' Black victims were regularly sacrificed to the powers of the underworld; a black ewe to Ge (*Il.* iii. 103 f.) and to Teiresias (*Od.* xi. 32 f.), a black bull to Achilles (Philostr. *Heroica* xx. 25) and to the Greeks who fell at Plataea (Plut. *Aristid.* 21), black rams to heroes (Paus. i. 34, 5; v. 13, 2; ix. 39, 6; Strab. vi. 284) and to Typhos (Ar. *Ran.* 848), a black lamb to Hiems (Verg. *aen.* iii. 120), Nox and Tellus (*ibid.* vi. 249 f.). The chthonian character of Poseidon sufficiently accounts for both his earthquakes and his black victims. That Delos should have been chosen as the birth-place of the sun-god because 'some pious soul, perhaps a pirate withal, may have seen some glory of sunrise on the rocky cliff and wondered' (p. 117) is hardly to be inferred from *h. hom.* i. 135 ff. It savours too much of the old picturesque interpretations of ῥοδοδάκτυλος and εὐθείελος. Lastly, Mr. Frazer has made it probable (*Golden Bough*, ii. 213 ff., 233 f.; *Pausanias*, vol. iii. p. 341 f.) that the Spartan διαμαρτυρίῳις was in its origin not merely an endurance test (p. 39) but a primitive religious purification.

Another pitfall in the path of a writer on this intricate subject is the exaggeration of foreign elements. Egyptian influence on Greek life was in the main external and, apart from a few legends (Io, Epaphus, Danaus, &c.), had little to do with religion. Prof. Campbell may, however, be right in holding that Orphism 'had a root in some imperfect knowledge of Egyptian rites' (pp. 191, 247—250), though he admits that 'the chief doctrine of the Orphics, the immortality of the soul, combined with metempsychosis, and with the hope of ultimate deliverance from the body, is essentially different from the Egyptian belief in the Ka.' The Egyptian element in Pythagoreanism, which he is inclined to credit (pp. 191, 248 f.), is also probable enough (Jevons, *Introd. Hist. Rel.*, pp. 320—324), but requires further proof. Abstinence from beans at least does not spell Egypt; see Lenormant in *Dar-Sagl. Dict. Ant.* II. ii. 947; Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. iv., p. 240 f. On the other hand, Foucart's Egyptising hypotheses as to the origin of Demeter-worship should have been

more decisively rejected. And Egyptian traits in the cult of the Argolic Hera (p. 239) and of Dionysus (p. 269)—unless by Dionysus is meant Zagreus—need substantiating. That the Gorgoneion of Greek art originated in the Arabian Besa (p. 49) is a highly precarious hypothesis. J. Six, *de Gorgone*, p. 94, has discredited it, and Furtwängler, once a believer, has now recanted (Roscher, *Lex.* I. ii. 1705, 55). Babylonian elements are rightly relegated to the background (pp. 9 f., 14 f., 45, 107 f., 142, 163); and no stress is laid on Aeschylus' possible acquaintance with Persian learning (p. 280) or the indebtedness of Plato to Zoroastrianism (p. 349). Adolph Holm remarks (*Hist. Gr.* i. 101) that 'of late a decided reaction has set in against the popular theory of the great influence exercised by the Phoenicians on Greece.' Prof. Campbell cannot be reckoned among the reactionaries. He finds Phoenician traits not only in Heracles (pp. 137 f., 159 f., 190), Aphrodite (pp. 159, 189, 234), and Cadmus (p. 35, *alib.*), but also in Demeter Achaia (p. 190), Poseidon at Onchestus and Corinth (pp. 111, 159 f., 189), Athena Onca at Thebes (p. 189), Despoina at Lycosura (p. 189), Dionysus (pp. 160, 189, 269), the Cabiri in Samothrace (p. 159), the Dioscuri (pp. 159 f., 189) and Helen (p. 189), Minos (p. 35, *alib.*) and Daedalus (p. 35). He even leans to Bérard's view that Zeus Lycaeus was a Phoenician Baal (p. 37); Farnell, *Cults*, i. 41 f., and Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. iv., p. 385 f., are content to recognise here a wolf-god; and the latter explains the two pillars that stood in front of his altar as perhaps columns for determining solstices and equinoxes. On p. 35 the Phoenician settlement at Thebes is well defended against the current objection that Thebes was too far inland for so maritime a folk by the analogous occupation of Tamasus in Cyprus. The suggestion is also made that Semitic influence in early Greece would account for 'the readiness with which, in later times, oriental symbolism and magic obtained so wide a hold on the Hellenic mind' (p. 35). Phrygian contact is admitted in the case of Rhea (p. 239), the Ephesian Artemis (pp. 39, 191), and Dionysus (pp. 243, 251). On pp. 194, 286 f., attention is drawn to the curious fact that 'Attic tragedy from the first revolved continually about the legends of Thebes and Argos.' This is usually explained by the large part that both traditions had played in epic poetry: but here two further explanations are offered; (1) that the birth of tragedy coincided with the reign of Pisistratus, who

allied himself with Argos and probably with Thebes; (2) that Argive (= Tantalid = Phrygian) and Theban (= Cadmean = Phoenician) stories fascinated the cultured Athenian by the contrast which they presented to Hellenic moderation and reflection.

In an undertaking of such wide compass there are bound to be gaps and omissions. One of the most noticeable of these is Aristophanes, to whom no separate treatment is accorded. Xenophanes, too, is dismissed with less than a page, though from a religious point of view he is a significant figure. Hesiod's so-called 'Delphic' phraseology deserves at least a mention (see *Class. Rev.* viii. 381 ff.); and the same may be said of Bacchylides' misuse of religious epithets (*ibid.* xii. 343 ff.). Indeed, the importance of cult-epithets in general is hardly realised. Bruchmann's *Epitheta deorum quae apud poetas Graecos leguntur* is in itself a store-house of religious beliefs; and one of the most pressing needs of modern archaeologists is a similar collection for the prose-writers. Hades is κλυτόπωλος in Homer, not ταχύπωλος as is implied on p. 70. That Hermes' epithet Ἀργειφόντης 'dimly alludes to another part of his legend, not mentioned in the Iliad' (p. 63) is the view of a minority now-a-days: see Pauly-Wissowa II. i. 703, 51 ff. And that Athena Alea 'in accordance with her title . . . gave shelter to the fugitive and even to the criminal' (p. 143), if true at all, is not the whole truth: see *ibid.* II. ii. 1974, 21 ff. The reason of Hephaestus' lameness (κλυτοδιδών) is left undetermined on p. 65, where Prof. Ridgeway's theory deserves a place. He points out that the divine smith (Hephaestus in the south, Völundr or Wieland in the north) is lame simply because the human smith was lame; the lame man in a primitive community was useless as a warrior and was therefore left behind to forge weapons for the rest.

Some questionable statements of a miscellaneous sort may be noticed here. The equation 'Uranus = Varuna' (p. 44) is probably but not quite certainly correct: see Schrader-Jevons, *Prehist. Ant.*, pp. 130, 412, 417, Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 28. What evidence has been adduced for the identification of Athena Onca with the armed Aphrodite (p. 142)? The latter was undoubtedly of Eastern origin (Farnell *Cults*, ii. 653 f.), but whether the former was Phoenician or not is a moot point (Farnell *ibid.* i. 300; Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. v., p. 49; Dümmler in Pauly-Wissowa, II. ii. 1949, 23 ff.). That in early times 'the chief anxiety of the living was to prevent

the spirits of the dead from coming back again' (p. 228) is a statement needing qualification: see the important article on the funeral law of Iulis by Dr. Jevons in the *Class. Rev.* ix. 247 ff. On p. 280 it is said 'that in Aeschylean tragedy the dead, even when deified, are never spoken of as blessed': surely *Pers.* 633 μακαρίτας ἰσοδαίμων βασιλεὺς sufficiently disproves the dictum. Why should we trace Spartan influence in the crown of wild olive awarded at Olympia (p. 153)? The prize was in all likelihood determined on religious, not economical, grounds: cp. Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. iii., pp. 484, 573. Prof. Campbell doubts the view 'which refers peculiarities of Spartan marriage customs to a survival from savage life, before the family had become a settled institution' (p. 150), but offers no definite alternative. He thinks (p. 270) that Dionysiac festivals were first instituted by 'the wise tolerance of some Greek ruler,' who allowed his subjects once a year to give vent to the exuberance of their animal nature, thereby at once indulging and regulating emotions that could not be suppressed. This homoeopathic hypothesis seems to be based on the legend that, when the Proetides were seized with madness because they would not accept Dionysiac rites, Melampus cured them by chasing them μετ' ἀλαλαγμοῦ καὶ τινος ἐνθίου χορείας from the mountains to Sicyon (Apollod. ii. 2, 2). But the interpretation of the whole myth and of others like it (Minyades, Pentheus) is far too uncertain to warrant any such inferences: see Voigt in Roscher, *Lex.* I. i. 1054, 10-36, Bather in *J.H.S.* xiv. 260 f., Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. v., p. 382 f. That Zeus Teleios had a priest of the family of Buzugae at Athens (p. 211) is an isolated and meaningless fact unless *C.I.A.* iii. 294 be supplemented by Plut. *conjug. praec.* 42, as is done by Toepffer in Pauly-Wissowa, III. i. 1095, 19 ff. On p. 112 Theognis is said to have given the first clear utterance to that strain of pessimism which so often appears in Greek literature: but in *Il.* xxiv. 527 f. the store-house of Zeus has two jars of evil to one of good (unless indeed the text preserved by Plato, *Rep.* 379 D is correct), and the fixed epic phrase δειλοῖσι βροτῶν points in the same direction; on pessimism in Hesiod see Warr, *The Greek Epic*, p. 234. That Thales' philosophy in some sense found an echo in contemporary minds is scarcely to be inferred from the Pindaric proverb ἀριστον μὲν ἔδωκε κ.τ.λ. (p. 165): see W. Christ and Fennell on *Ol.* i. 1. Finally, can it be maintained that Epicurus and his

follo  
criti  
340  
was  
mov  
posi  
The  
βιο  
a r  
pair  
136  
thou  
sour  
anti  
at s  
ease  
p. 5  
Zell  
A  
offer  
116)  
tran  
shad  
poun  
Socr  
Ascl  
healt  
asia,  
Socr  
did, c  
Phae  
receiv  
praye  
attem  
pecul  
τίραν  
by th  
not f  
where  
tolera  
In  
ternal  
is pic  
phrase  
Plato.  
'glori  
ing hu  
tion o  
some r  
in amb  
the glo  
'in th  
rays v  
bined  
absenc  
evitabl  
book, a  
times i  
293) a  
the pa  
NO. C



followers combined the atomism of Democritus with the *hedonism of Aristippus* (p. 340)? The pleasure sought by the Cyrenaics was the enjoyment of the moment *ἡδονάθεια μονόχρονος* (Aristipp. *ap.* Athen. xii. 544 A), positive in character, and mainly physical. The object of the Epicureans was *ἡ τοῦ ὅλου βίῃ μακαριότης* (Diog. x. 148) resulting from a rational computation of pleasures and pains; it was *ἀραξία καὶ ἀπονία* (Diog. x. 136) negative rather than positive; and, though they admitted that the body was the source of all pleasure, yet since memory and anticipation accumulate feeling they aimed at securing mental rather than physical ease (Diog. x. 137): see Ritter and Preller,<sup>7</sup> p. 386 f., Usener, *Epicurea*, p. 293 f.; Zeller, *Stoics*, etc., p. 474 ff.

Among the happier novelties incidentally offered by the book is the suggestion (p. 116) that Mimnermus in dwelling on the transient character of human life fore-shadows the philosophy of change propounded by Heraclitus. On pp. 234, 326 Socrates' dying words 'We owe a cock to Asclepius' are well explained: 'the god of health is regarded as the author of Euthanasia, or painless death . . . May not Socrates have prayed for this as Cassandra did, or rather, had he not prayed for it in *Phaedo*, 117 B, C; and would not Crito receive comfort from the assurance that the prayer was heard?' Ingenious is also the attempt on p. 286 to account for some peculiarities of tragic diction, *e.g.* the use of *τίπάρως* with no disparaging association, by the hypothesis that Sophocles wrote not for Athens only but for all Ionia, where despotic government had long been tolerated.

In conclusion, a word or two about externals. Prof. Campbell's style throughout is piquant and full of those felicities of phrase which charm us in his editions of Plato. What could be neater than Solon's 'glorified common sense,' or 'the all-searching humanity' of Sophocles, or the description of the Homeric poems as 'preserving some relics of an immemorial past like flies in amber, while bearing on their surface all the gloss of novelty,' or the statement that 'in the white light of Socrates the several rays which coloured later ethics are combined'? At the same time the general absence of references to authorities, inevitable in a lecture but culpable in a serious book, and the inconsistent use of notes, sometimes incorporated in the text (*e.g.* pp. 156, 293) and sometimes printed at the foot of the page, give the work a slovenly and

unscholarly appearance which by no means corresponds to its character. Misprints are not frequent, but 'Gulf of Lions' (p. 43) should be corrected, and three mistakes in the Byron couplet quoted on p. 303 rectified: presumably too 'henceforward' should be inserted after 'nothing is' on p. 114 (16 lines from the bottom) and 'premeta-physical' read for 'metaphysical' on p. 383. The rather grotesque paraphrase of *h. hom.* vii. 45 ff. 'A bear breaks out amidships, and sits up with threats' (p. 121) might be improved.

If the points to which I have taken exception appear numerous, it must be borne in mind that many of them are details which do not detract from the main lines of argument, while some might be fairly regarded as matters of opinion. In so wide a field a few weeds and barren patches may well be excused, especially as this precise plot has not been fenced in and tilled by British hands before. Prof. Campbell, who in a prefatory epigram modestly describes himself as *καυῆς δόγμαθ' ὁ σοφίας*, has given us a book containing the results of wide reading and (so far as his subject proper is concerned) of considerable insight. But he would probably be the first to allow that the final work, if finality on such a theme is conceivable, still remains to be written.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

#### MACDONALD'S HUNTERIAN CATALOGUE.

*Catalogue of Greek Coins in the Hunterian Collection.* Vol. I.: Italy, Sicily, Macedon, Thrace and Thessaly. By GEORGE MACDONALD. Glasgow: Maclehose. 1899. Pp. lxvi, 496; 30 plates. £3 3s. net.

THE celebrated, yet practically little known, collection of coins and medals bequeathed by William Hunter to the University of Glasgow consists of some 30,000 specimens, of which about 12,000 are Greek and 12,000 Roman. It was Hunter's intention to issue, with the aid of various scholars, a scientific catalogue in seven volumes, but only one volume, dealing with a portion of the Greek series, was ever published. This was the well-known *Descriptio* by Hunter's friend and numismatic adviser Charles Combe. The work appeared at the end of 1782, a few months before Hunter's death,

G G

and was referred to by Eckhel in his *Doctrina* as the 'Catalogus a Combio erudite, nitide et adcurate contextus.' This is a high encomium, but it is one which I feel sure might be applied, and with far greater justice, to the Catalogue that now succeeds (and supersedes) the work of Combe. Mr. George Macdonald's volume shows on every page a minute acquaintance with numismatic literature, and the copious indexes, the accurate descriptions and the chronological arrangement make the work as complete as a numismatist could desire. The book is handsomely printed and is very liberally illustrated, though the plates (executed by a Glasgow firm) hardly reach the uniform level of excellence attained by the London Auto-type Company.

Mr. Macdonald's conscientious care has led him to investigate the whole history of Hunter's acquisitions, and in his Introduction he has furnished, from Hunter's papers and from many other sources, a really fascinating record of the formation of the Museum Hunterianum. In a century by no means unproductive of coin-collectors, Hunter was a commanding figure. He began his work rather after the period when it was fashionable to sneer at collectors as 'critics in rust' or as the possessors of headless 'Helens' and spurious 'Othos.' He realised, in fact, the good type of collector foreshadowed in Addison's *Dialogue*; the man who does not merely collect for ostentation but who believes (in Addison's phrase) that a cabinet of medals may 'give a great light to history.' Hunter's career as a coin-collector dates practically from 1770, when he was at the height of his medical reputation in London. In that year he moved from Jermyn Street into his spacious house (now I believe incorporated with the Lyric Theatre) on the east side of Great Windmill Street, Piccadilly, and there arranged his anatomical and other collections. The nucleus of the coin-cabinet seems to have been a collection made at Aleppo by the Rev. William Dawes. The owner died before the purchase was completed, but he had a brother, the Rev. Arthur Dawes, who agreed to sell for £220 and the return of the duplicates. Mr. Dawes unpleasantly insinuated that some of the duplicates were kept back, and Hunter, in one of his vigorous letters (which Mr. Macdonald has done well to print) had to explain to him what a duplicate was. 'It would give me pain' (he added) 'to take your collection for less than what I suppose [its] value to be. What pleasure could it be (and I collect for pleasure) to look at coins

for which you, or your children, ought to have had more money?'

It was Hunter's policy, as it has been the policy of many distinguished private collectors (of Mr. Montagu, for instance, in recent times), to purchase collections *en bloc* and then to sell the duplicates. By the acquisition in 1773 of the Peralta cabinet he brought up his own total to nearly 10,000, and in 1776 he paid £8,000 for the great collection of Matthew Duane, an antiquarian solicitor who still figures in the list of British Museum benefactors. Duane's collection had itself been formed from several cabinets of note, such as those of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, Richard Mead, Martin Folkes and the Prince of Torremuzza. In 1782 Hunter acquired a fine series of Roman gold by the purchase of the numismatic portion of the Museum Francianum, formed originally by Joseph de France. Meanwhile, he bought steadily, on a smaller scale, through honest dealers like Thane and old Thomas Snelling. Numerous friends also contributed to his stores, and from Bruce, the Abyssinian traveller, he procured many of the gold 'Ptolemies' that form a striking feature of the collection.

Among Hunter's correspondents was Sir William Hamilton, the Ambassador at Naples. Mr. Macdonald publishes several letters from Hamilton which, in the uncertainty of their spelling, recall the epistles of Lady Emma Hamilton. Hamilton disclaimed all knowledge of coins, yet it is clear that he rather valued himself on his numismatic acumen. On one occasion he suggested (unsuccessfully) to the cautious Hunter the purchase of a collection belonging to a scion of 'one of the first families' in Italy. The owner was a gambler, and the diplomatist's idea was to bargain with the noble gamester when his luck was bad. At a later date, he bought for Hunter, though without Hunter's authorisation, a cabinet offered by an apparently worthy abbé for £330. The collection was duly shipped to London. Hunter, or at any rate the faithful Combe, was at the Docks to receive it, and two other collectors, the Rev. Mr. Southgate and 'Cratchrod,' (Clayton Mordaunt Cracherode) seem to have been lurking in the neighbourhood. The coins were unusually well packed, but the rare specimens proved to be false and the genuine pieces to be duplicates, sometimes to the extent of eight or ten. When re-sold in London this 'choice assemblage' realized about £80. Both Hamilton and Hunter behaved very well about the payment.

For an Appendix, Mr. Macdonald has

tra  
Bo  
the  
way  
178  
One  
refe  
tion  
exte  
seen  
perb  
unes  
whic  
was  
noto

The  
Em  
Alba  
Mulva  
De Co  
cal N  
Emend  
on Cle  
Notes o  
ian Eth  
iii. 1 §  
Jackson

Revi  
Gloss  
daica,  
César d  
1, iii. 2  
S. Reine  
No. Tra  
and mai  
dead, wh  
thence i  
nel sur  
is true  
Pharsali  
e.g. in 1  
and it is  
having b  
ably to  
gammes  
the last  
music the  
diatonic  
extract is  
which we  
that the f  
time when  
suppression  
The Phry  
tonic scale  
taut. Re  
collected  
attacks of  
months.  
manœuvre  
P. Foucar

transcribed the entries in Hunter's Account Book. The addition sums are worked by the great collector in a somewhat casual way, but it is clear that between 1770 and 1782 he spent on his coins nearly £23,000. One important item of £770 was mysteriously referred to in Combe's *Descriptio* as a collection procured from a certain 'vir apud exteros prænobilis,' an expression which seems to suggest a distinguished foreigner, perhaps a Count. But Mr. Macdonald has unearthed a promissory note of Hunter's which proves that the seller of this collection was the fourth Earl of Sandwich, the notorious Jammy Twitcher.

In conclusion, it should be stated that Dr. Young, the keeper of the Hunterian Museum, has done useful preliminary work in connexion with the re-arrangement of the collection and that the expenses of publication have been borne with well-directed generosity by Mr. James Stevenson of Hailie. Mr. Macdonald's share in the work has been in every way a labour of love, and all numismatists will hope that he may be able to continue and complete his admirable Catalogue without delay.

WARWICK WROTH.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

### The Journal of Philology. No. 53. 1899.

*Emendationes Homericae* (Od. x.-xii.), T. L. Agar. *Alba Longa*, T. Ashby. *Colours in Greek*, C. M. Mulvany. *Oxford MSS. of Dionysius Halicarnassensis*, De Compositione Verborum, A. B. Poynton. *Critical Notes on Valerius Flaccus*, J. P. Postgate. *Emendations of Quintus Smyrnaeus*, A. Platt. *Notes on Clement of Alexandria II.*, H. Jackson. *Further Notes on Passages in the Seventh Book of the Eudemian Ethics*, H. Jackson. *On Nicomachean Ethics iii. 1 § 17, 1111 a 8, and Republic viii. 563 C*, H. Jackson.

### Revue de Philologie. Vol. 23, 3. July, 1899.

*Glossarium sive vocabularium ad Oracula Chal-daica*, confect A. Jahnius. *Corrections au texte de César de bello gallico*, L. Constans. On i. 44. 7, 51. 1, iii. 24. 3, viii. 4. 1. *Adéis προγόνων ἀδελφιστῶν*, S. Reinach. In answer to P. Tannery in the last No. Translates 'l'absolution des ancêtres coupables,' and maintains that the reference is to prayers for the dead, which was an Orphic custom, and introduced thence into Christianity. *Une contre-sense traditionnel sur Virg. Géorg. i. 489-492*. A. Cartault. It is true that the confusion between Philippi and Pharsalia is common among poets later than Vergil e.g. in Lucan, but we need not attribute it to V. and it is possible that it arose from the word *iterum* having been misunderstood. The reference is probably to the two battles of Philippi. *Anciennes gammes enharmoniques*, L. Laloy. Continued from the last No. Among the three kinds of Greek music the enharmonic enjoyed the most favour, the diatonic and the chromatic being much rarer. An extract is given from Aristoxenos in Athenaeus from which we gather that it was in the Dorian mood that the first enharmonic melodies were written, at a time when this scale was not characterized by the suppression of the second note of the tetrachord. The Phrygian mood seems better suited to the diatonic scale. *Sur Horace*, Epode ix. 19, 20. A. Cartault. Refers to the way in which Antonius had collected his vessels as far as possible from the attacks of Octavian, where he kept them for long months. These two lines simply refer to this manoeuvre. *Στρατηγὸς φιλάτος, Στρατηγὸς ἀνθρώπτος*, P. Foucart. On the origin of these expressions.

*Un cas unique de cautionnement*, T. W. Beasley. On a passage of Pseudo-Aristotle *περὶ θαυμασίων ἀκουσμάτων*. *Inscriptions d'Héraclée du Latmos*, B. Haussoullier. *Un nouveau milliaire au nom de Manius Aquillius*, B. Haussoullier. The date of this inscr. is 129-126 B.C. when M. Aquillius was in Asia as the first organizer of that province.

### Neue Jahrbücher für Klassische Altertum, etc. Vol. 3. Part 4, 1899.

*Die Bildung der griechischen Religion*, O. Seeck. On 'Animismus' or spirit-worship. The Phaeacian myth is the earliest representation by the Greeks of the land of the dead. *Heron von Alexandria*, W. Schmidt. H. probably flourished in the first century A.D. Some account is given of his mechanical inventions, illustrated by three plates. *Das Regenwunder im Quadenlande*, J. Geffcken. Deals with the ancient and modern literature of the Thundering Legion. The polemic of the last ten years on this subject has been rich in results. *Eine neue Philosophie der Geschichte*, O. Treuber. A review of Barth's *Die Philosophie Der Geschichte als Soziologie*, Part I.

Part 5. *Die Bildung der griechischen Religion*, O. Seeck. On sun-worship. The difficulty of the deification of abstractions, such as Victory etc., is met by the consideration that certain aspects of personal gods have by specialization melted away into abstractions. *Ciceros Villen*, O. E. Schmidt. An account with a plate and two illustrations in the text of Cicero's villas at Arpinum and Formiae. *Ein antikes Vereinsstatut*, E. Drerup. A further elucidation of an inscription discovered at Athens and published in 1894 referring to the regulations of the association or guild of the Iobacchi of the third century A.D.

Parts 6, 7. *Die Bildung der griechischen Religion*, O. Seeck. On religion and morality. Spirit-worship and sun-worship had originally no connexion with morality, but morality grew and gradually transformed religion, so that in Homer the latter had reached a height that is worthy of respect compared with what had gone before. But no sooner had Homer become known by written publication than the philosophers, beginning with Heraclitus, denounced the poets, especially Homer and Hesiod, as

teachers of immortality. *Über einige neuere Erscheinungen der griechischen Geschichtschreibung*, B. Niese. This is a review of the following works: Schoemann's *Griechische Altertümer* by J. H. Lipsius, Vol. 1 *Das Staatswesen*; Busolt's *Griechische Geschichte*, Vol. 3, Part 1, *Die Pentekontaetie*; Beloch's *Griechische Geschichte*, Vol. 2; Holm's *Geschichte Siciliens im Altertum*, Vol. 3; and A. Bauer's *Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte 1888-1898. Zum gegenwärtigen Stande der Platonischen Frage*, O. Immisch. The 'Platonic question' concerns the genuineness and the chronological order of the Platonic writings. The writer severely criticizes Lutoslawski's 'stilometry' of Plato on the ground of want of philosophical and historical appreciation. The later Platonic investigation has three fundamental divisions: (1) the problem of the Republic, (2) the problem of the Phaedrus, (3) a satisfactory statement of the rules which determine the economy of the Platonic dialogue. The Republic is dealt with first. *Ciceros Villen*, O. E. Schmidt. On Cicero's villas at Tusculum, Cumae, Puteoli, Pompeii, and those on the Latin coast. *Phidyle*, Th. Plüss. Discusses how far the sentiment of the Phidyle Ode of Horace (iii. 23) is connected with a belief in the moral elevation of the Delphic Apollo.

**Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie.**  
1899.

16 Aug. F. Hommel, *Die altisraelitische Überlieferung in inschriftlicher Beleuchtung* (P. Jensen). 'Rich in thought but ineffective.' A. Ludwich, *Die Homeruloga als voralexandrisch erwiesen* (P. Cauer), favourable. L. Adam, *Homer der Erzieher der Griechen* (P. Cauer). 'Does not adequately fulfil its aim.' A. Bauer, *Die Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte 1888-1898* (Schneider), favourable. G. Fougères, *De Lyciorum communi* (A. Körte). 'Shows much acuteness, but would have been better in French.' *Griechische Tragödien*, übers. von U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. I. Sophocles' *Oedipus*. II-IV. Euripides' *Hippolytos*, *Hiketides*, *Herakles* (C. Haerlin), favourable. M. Wetzel, *Haben die Ankläger des Sokrates wirklich behauptet, dass er neue Götter einführe?* (A. Döring), unfavourable. C. Pascal, *Dizionario dell' uso Ciceroniano* (W. Hirschfelder). 'Useful to some extent, but incomplete.' F. Knoke, *Das Cäcinalager bei Mehrholz* (ed. Wolff), favourable. *Taciti de origine, ritu et moribus Germanorum liber*, ed. J. Holub (U. Zernial), favourable. *Prudentii Psychomachia*, ed. J. Bergman (J. Tolkiehn). 'Shows want of care and thoroughness.'

30 Aug. *Sammlung der griechischen Dialektschriften*, herausg. von Collitz und Bechtel. iii. 2, 1. *Die Inschriften von Lakonien* u.s.w., bearb. von R. Meister. ii. 6. *Die delphischen Inschriften*, 4 Teil, bearb. von J. Baunaek (P. Cauer), very favourable. R. Dieterich, *Testimonia de Herodoti vita* (M. Maas), 'The work of a ripe scholar.' G. Kazarow, *De foederis Phoenisium institutum* (K. Seeliger), favourable. E. Schmidt, *Pergamon* (R. Oehler), favourable. *Taciti vita Agricola*, ed. by H. Furneaux (Ed. Wolff), very favourable. *Taciti dialogus de oratoribus*, by A. Gudeman (Ed. Wolff). An abridgement of the larger edition, favourable.

6 Sept. J. Marouse, *Diätetik im Altertum* (R. Fuchs), very favourable. J. Vahlen, *Index lectionum* (H. J. Müller). Is concerned with certain corrupt passages in Cicero's philosophical writings. *Cicero, Actionis in Verrem sec. liber V*, comment. da V.

Brugnola (W. Hirschfelder), 'very careful and thorough.' *Tibullus, Untersuchung und Text*, von H. Belling (K. Jacoby), favourable. G. Andresen, *In Taciti Historias studia critica et palaeographica*, I. (Th. Opitz), 'contains very weighty results.'

13 Sept. J. Denissow, *Der Dochnius bei Aeschylus* (Wiedemann) I, very favourable. O. Schulthess, *Die Vormundschaftsrechnung des Demosthenes* (E. Rosenberg). 'The work of a master in his department.' F. Zimmerhaeckel, *Cäsars Rheinbrücke* (J. W.), favourable. *Traité de tactique* (*περί καταστάσεως ἀρχέου*), par C. Graux, préface par A. Martin (F. Hirsch), favourable. *Joannis Laurenti Lydi liber de mensibus* ed. R. Wuensch (F. Hirsch). 'Much more complete than previous editions.' E. Kautsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, 2-14. Lief. (R. Neumann). 'Not careful enough in chronological points.'

20 Sept. *Lycurgi oratio in Leocratem*, post C. Scheibe ed. Fr. Blass. Ed. major (E. Rosenberg), very favourable. J. Denissow, *Der Dochnius bei Aeschylus* (Fr. Wiedemann), II. 'Deserves the highest recognition.' *Caesaris commentarii de bello Gallico*, erkl. von F. Kraner. 16. A. von W. Dittenberger (E. Wolff). 'This edition has many improvements.'

27 Sept. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, I. Ed. by P. Grenfell and S. Hunt (O. Schulthess), favourable. 'A grammatical index required.' E. Drerup, *Antike Demosthenesaussagen* (E. Rosenberg), favourable. *Anarithi in X. libros priores Elementorum Euclidis Commentarii*, ed. M. Curtze (S. Günther). 'A great and difficult work.' E. P. Morris, *The subjunctive in independent sentences in Plantus* (H. Ziemer). 'Of permanent value for Latin syntax.' E. B. Lease, *I nunc and I with another imperative* (H. Ziemer), favourable.

4 Oct. *Pausanias, Beschreibung von Griechenland*, herausg. von H. Hitzig. I. Halbband, Buch I (Fr. Spiro), very favourable. H. Winckler, *Die Völker Vorderasiens* (V. Prásek), very favourable. H. Babucke, *Geschichte des Kolosseums*, H. Rüter, *Das Kapitöl*, C. Huelsen, *Bilder aus der Geschichte des Kapitols* (L. Ulrichs). All three favourably noticed. H. Gelzer, *Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*. ii. 2. (F. Hirsch). 'Treats of some oriental chronographers who have not yet been taken into account.'

**Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.** 1899.

April. Koetschau's *Origenes* I, II. (P. Wendland); unfavourable, except as regards the mechanical part. Blass's *Evangelium Secundum Lucam* and *Philology of the Gospels* (P. Corsen). In spite of his admiration for B.'s great qualities as a scholar, the reviewer cannot discover the Logos in these works, which clearly show prejudice.

May. *Anthologia latina* ed. Buecheler (G. Wisowa) very favourable; in some details improvement is possible.

July. Dieterich's *Untersuchungen der Griech. Sprache von der Hellenistischen Zeit bis zum 10. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (G. N. Hatzidakis) a step towards the solution of a very difficult problem. A. Mommsen's *Feste des Stadt Athen* (C. Robert); makes no small demands upon the critical faculty of its user. J. N. Svoronos *Der athenische Volkskalender* (Sonderabdruck aus dem *Journal Internationale d'archéologie numismatique* (the same reviewer) favourable. Lindsay's *Codex Turnebi* (E. Norden) favourable. L. has not completely disposed of the difficulties raised in the C.R. by Sonnenschein.